nbridge Bible

for

hools and Colleges

DUKE
UNIVERSITY

DIVINITY SCHOOL
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Duke University Libraries

https://archive.org/details/cambridgebiblefo461unse

THE CAMBRIDGE BIBLE
FOR SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

GENERAL EDITOR FOR THE NEW TESTAMENT:—
R. ST JOHN PARRY, D.D.,
FELLOW OF TRINITY COLLEGE

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE GALATIANS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

C. F. CLAY, MANAGER

LONDON : FETTER LANE, E.C.4

NEW YORK : THE MACMILLAN CO.

BOMBAY
CALCUTTA } MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.
MADRAS

TORONTO : THE MACMILLAN CO.
OF CANADA, LTD.

TOKYO : MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE

TO THE

GALATIANS

Edited by

A. LUKYN WILLIAMS, B.D.

Vicar of Guilden Morden and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Durham

WITH INTRODUCTION AND NOTES

Cambridge:
At the University Press
1921

First Edition 1911
Reprinted 1921

Printed in Great Britain
by Turnbull & Spears, Edinburgh

Div. S.
220.7
B173B
V.4-6

PREFACE

BY THE

GENERAL EDITOR FOR THE NEW TESTAMENT

THE General Editor does not hold himself responsible, except in the most general sense, for the statements, opinions, and interpretations contained in the several volumes of this Series. He believes that the value of the Introduction and the Commentary in each case is largely dependent on the Editor being free as to his treatment of the questions which arise, provided that that treatment is in harmony with the character and scope of the Series. He has therefore contented himself with offering criticisms, urging the consideration of alternative interpretations, and the like; and as a rule he has left the adoption of these suggestions to the discretion of the Editor.

TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.
September, 1910.

289660

PREFACE

THE same methods have been adopted in the preparation of the following Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians as in that of the volume on the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon, viz. first, the independent use of concordance and grammar, and only afterwards the examination of commentaries and other aids.

The difficulties of the Epistle are not of the same kind as those of Colossians and Philemon. There (especially in Colossians) many strange words which in after years acquired highly technical meanings had to be considered; here rather historical circumstances and Jewish modes of thought.

The former of these unfortunately are still far from certain. Even the district intended by Galatia is doubtful, and the discussion of it is often conducted with more warmth than its importance warrants. Personally I greatly regret that I am unable to accept the very attractive theory presented with so much brilliancy of expression and originality of thought by Sir William Ramsay, viz. that the Churches of Galatia to whom St Paul here writes are those whose origin is described at length in Acts xiii. and xiv. Its fundamental presupposition is that, as St Paul's plan of campaign was to win the Roman Empire for Christ by seizing strategic points, he would not have visited so outlying a part as Northern Galatia. Hence if the Acts and our Epistle, backed up though they are by the consensus of Patristic evidence, appear to say that he did do so, this can be only in appearance not in fact. But I confess that the more I study the arguments adduced against the *primâ facie* meaning of the passages in question

the less they impress me, and, in particular, all attempts to date the Epistle on what may be called the Southern theory appear to me to fail. I therefore find myself reluctantly compelled to adhere to the older opinion that the Epistle was written to the Churches of North Galatia, at a date between the writing of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians and the Epistle to the Romans.

Of more permanent interest is the revelation in this Epistle of St Paul's training in Jewish modes of thought and exegesis. These indeed may be traced in every book of the N.T. (though the words and phrases due to them are often grossly misunderstood by friend and foe), but here they obtrude themselves on the most careless of readers. No one but a Jew accustomed to Rabbinic subtlety would have thought of the argument of the curse (iii. 13, 14), or of the seed (iii. 16), or even of Sarah and Hagar (iv. 21—27). These and other examples in our Epistle of the working of Paul's mind ought perhaps to have given more stimulus to the study of his mental equipment than has been the case.

Far more important however in our Epistle than either of these two rather academic subjects is its insistence upon the true character of the Gospel. St Paul opposed, with all the warmth of knowledge bought by experience, the supposition that Christ came only to reform Judaism, to open its door more widely to the Gentiles, or to attract them by the substitution of another Law of commands and ordinances for that to which they had been accustomed as heathen. It is the verdict of history that his efforts, though successful for the moment, have to a great extent been a failure. To try to keep rules and to observe commands and prohibitions is, comparatively speaking, so easy, that the Christian Church has only too often preferred to

289660

set up a Law of this kind, in preference to accepting the Gospel in its simplicity, which is the good news of immediate pardon for the sinner, and of free grace continually bestowed in Christ. It is this Gospel, with all that it involves of freedom from legal bondage, whether Jewish or Christian, which is the central truth of our Epistle, this which the student must endeavour to grasp and make his own, with a knowledge bought, like St Paul's, by experience, and a love deepening with the increased perception of the love of God in Christ (ii. 20).

The only differences between this edition and that published in the C(ambridge) G(reek) T(estament for Schools) are: (1) The substitution of English for Greek and the omission of such notes as require knowledge of Greek on the part of the reader. In some cases passages in Latin have been also translated into English. (2) The addition of the renderings of the Revised Version, both text and margin, whenever these appear to be of interest. (3) The insertion of a few illustrative renderings from Wyclif (1380), Tyndale (1534), the Great Bible (1539), Geneva (1557), Rheims (1582) (the text in each case being that of Bagster's *The English Hexapla in parallel columns*), and from Luther's German Version (1545), and Osterwald's French Version (1891).

It will be observed that when an obelisk (†) is affixed to a word it means that all the passages are mentioned where the word of the original Greek occurs in the New Testament, and that when the double obelisk (‡) is affixed it means that all the passages are mentioned where the word occurs in the Greek Bible. A. L. W.

October 1910.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND IMPRESSION

A few alterations have been made, and some longer notes may be found in the Addenda, p. xii. A. L. W.

May 1921.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

PAGE

I. The History of the Galatians and of the Province of Galatia xiii

1. The Galatians until the formation of the Province. The name. Their settlement in Asia Minor xiii

i. Early history in Asia xiv

ii. The intervention of the Romans ... xiv

2. The Province 25 A.D. to 73 A.D. xv

3. Later history of the Province xv

II. The Galatians of the Epistle: Who were they? Preliminary Questions xvi

1. Usage of the terms 'Galatia' and 'Galatians' xvi

i. Literary xvi

a. Three passages from the Greek Bible; 1 Mac. viii. 1, 2; 2 Mac. viii. 20; 2 Tim. iv. 10 ... xvi

b. Non-Biblical writers xvii

α. Evidence of the employment of the terms in the wider and official sense xvii

β. Evidence of the employment of the terms in the narrower and popular sense xviii

c. 1 Pet. i. 1 xix

ii. The Evidence of the Inscriptions ... xx

iii. The alleged constant use by St Paul of the Roman official terms xxi

iv. 1 Cor. xvi. 1. The Collection expected from Galatia xxiii

PAGE

2. Did St Paul ever visit North Galatia? ... xxiv
   i. Acts xvi. 6 xxv
   ii. Acts xviii. 23 xxvi
3. The cause of St Paul's preaching to the Galatians xxvii
4. The meaning of 'the first time' (iv. 13) ... xxvii
5. 'You' in ii. 5 xxviii

III. The Galatians of the Epistle: Who were they? (continued) xxviii
Further evidence adduced in favour of either theory.
1. In support of the South Galatian theory ... xxviii
   i. Generally xxviii
      a. Improbability that the Churches of South Galatia should have been passed over by St Paul xxviii
      b. The prominence of those Churches in early Church history xxix
   ii. The contents of the Epistle in relation to this question xxx
      a. The relations of Gentiles and Jews xxx
      b. Barnabas xxx
      c. 'As an angel of God' (iv. 14) ... xxx
      d. Freedom xxxi
      e. Legal customs (see Appendix, Note C) xxxi
      f. The address at Antioch of Pisidia (Acts xiii. 16—41) ... xxxi
2. In support of the North Galatian theory ... xxxii
   i. Patristic xxxii
   ii. The bearing of the question of the date upon this question xxxiii

Conclusion: The balance of the evidence inclines to the belief that the readers lived in North Galatia ... xxxiii

PAGE

IV. The Time of Writing xxxiv
1. Limits of date. See also Appendix, Note B xxxiv
2. Dates affixed by those who uphold the South Galatian theory xxxv
3. Dates upon the North Galatian theory ... xxxvi
The Epistle must be placed between 2 Cor. and Rom. xxxviii

V. The danger to which the Galatians were exposed, and the manner in which St Paul met it xxxix

VI. The Permanent Value of the Epistle ... xlii

VII. The Canonicity and Genuineness of the Epistle xliv

VIII. The Text xlvii

IX. A Plan of the Epistle xlvii

X. Commentaries, etc. xlix

XI. Chronology of part of St Paul's life lii

TEXT AND NOTES 1

APPENDIX

NOTE A. The term 'Arabia' in the Epistle ... 115
NOTE B. ii. 1—10 in relation to Ac. xv. 4—29 ... 116
NOTE C. Legal customs mentioned in the Epistle 118
NOTE D. Archbishop Temple on iii. 20 121
NOTE E. Law or The Law 121
NOTE F. Spirit or The Spirit 122

INDICES

GENERAL 124
SCRIPTURAL 127

MAP

ASIA MINOR IN THE TIME OF ST PAUL ... ... *at end of volume*

ADDENDA

P. xxvi, note, l. 6. Ramsay (*Hist. Comm.*, p. 210), followed by Kirsopp Lake (*Earlier Epistles*, p. 313), claims, *in urbe Antiochiae Pisidiae* [*ex regione Phrygiae Galaciae*] *sub praeside Magno*—"in the city of Antioch of Pisidia [belonging to the district of Phrygia Galatia], when Magnus was the governor"—from the *Menologium Sirletianum* quoted in the *Acta Sanctorum* for Sept. 28 (pp. 600 *sqq.*). But (1) Basnage (in Canisius, *Thesaurus*, 1725, III. i. 142) attributes this menologion to the eleventh century; (2) The clause here bracketed is absent from the older Latin form and from the Greek form; (3) It looks like a worthless conflation of two glosses, each of which is justifiable in itself.

P. xxxiv, notes, last line. The thesis, "Galatians, the earliest of the Pauline Epistles," is defended by Mr C. W. Emmet in his edition of the Epistle, 1912.

P. 59, *l.* 12. But it may only mark 'righteousness' as abstract, and at the same time show that the Greek word for righteousness is the subject, not the predicate.

P. 113, *l.* 9. Dr J. H. Moulton suggested that the scars on St Paul were to Roman officials marks of identification, in accordance with descriptions found in the papyri. He also thought that Saul of Tarsus had seen the scars and marks on the face of the Lord Jesus in the Judgment Hall and on Calvary (*Expository Times*, March 1910, p. 283).

INTRODUCTION

CHAPTER I.

The History of the Galatians and of the Province of Galatia.

1. *The Galatians.* The relation of the words Celtae, Galatae and Galli is obscure, and the meaning of each is doubtful. Celtae may be derived either from the root *cel* (cf. 'celsus') and may mean 'superior,' 'noble,' or perhaps from a root seen in the old Teutonic *hildja-*, and may mean 'warriors'; Galatae may be from the root *gala-* and mean 'brave,' 'warriors'; and Galli may be either from the same root *gala*, with the same meaning, or from *ghas-lo-s* and mean 'strangers,' 'foreigners[1].'

The term Galatians was given to those portions of the Celtic race which migrated from the East to Europe in the 4th and 3rd centuries B.C., and, on the one hand, settled finally in North Italy 390 B.C. and Gaul, and, on the other, after being repulsed in Greece 280 B.C. passed over into Asia Minor. These last were sometimes called Gallograecians. For some centuries the terms Galatians and Gauls were used to designate either branch of settlers (see below, pp. xvi. sq.)[2]. A few commentators have

[1] See A. Holder, *Alt-Celtischer Sprachschatz*, 1896, under these words. He gives in columns 1522—1620 a unique collection of quotations from ancient writers and inscriptions relative to Galatia.

[2] e.g. by Polybius and Plutarch, *passim*. Even the Greek Paraphrase of Caesar's Commentaries by Planudes Maximus, *c.* 1300 A.D., begins: 'All "Galatia" is divided into three parts.'

even supposed that our Epistle was written to Churches situated in what we now call France.

(i) *Early history in Asia.* On crossing into Asia Minor at the invitation of Nicomedes I of Bithynia, 'who concluded a treaty with the seventeen Celtic chiefs, securing their aid against his brothers,' they settled in what was afterwards known as Galatia[1], harassing all Asia Minor as far as the Taurus, until they were confined to Galatia proper by the victories of the Kings of Pergamos, and in particular by Attalus I between 240 and 230 B.C.

They were composed of three tribes, the Trokmi in the east, whose centre was Tavium, the Tectosages in the centre round Ancyra, and the Tolistobogii on the west round Pessinus. They thus held the old Royal Road from the Euphrates to Ephesus, which passed either through or near to those towns, and also were within striking distance from the newer route through South Phrygia and Lycaonia.

Other waves of conquest had preceded them, notably that of the Phryges about the 10th century B.C., who had by the 3rd century coalesced with the earlier inhabitants, and had given their name to the whole people. Thus the Galatians became the ruling power among a large population of Phrygians, and naturally did not remain unaffected by them.

(ii) *The intervention of the Romans.* In 189 B.C. the consul Cn. Manlius Vulso led a successful expedition against them, and in consequence they seem to have submitted to the rulers of Cappadocia and of Pontus. But about 160 B.C. they conquered part of Lycaonia, the inhabitants of which are therefore called by the geographer Ptolemy (v. 4. 10 [8]) 'inhabitants of the added land.' In 88 B.C. they helped the Romans in their struggle with

[1] Perhaps the best map for a dispassionate study of Asia Minor is that edited by Mr J. G. C. Anderson, published in Murray's Handy Classical Series, 1903, price 1*s*. For a map showing the historical changes in the development of the Province of Galatia see *Encycl. Biblica*, col. 1592.

Mithridates King of Pontus. In 64 B.C. the Romans appointed three tetrarchs, of whom Deiotarus of the Tolistobogii made himself supreme, and was recognized by the Romans as King of Galatia. He died in 41 B.C. In 36 B.C. Amyntas, who had been made King of Pisidia by Antony in 39 B.C., received in addition 'Galatia proper, with Isauria, part of Pamphylia, and W. Cilicia, as well as the Lycaonian plain intervening between his Pisidian and his Galatian dominions,' including, it will be noted, both Iconium and Lystra as well as Antioch.

2. *The Roman Province of Galatia*, 25 to 73 A.D.

(i) On the death of Amyntas in 25 B.C., his kingdom was formed into a Roman Province, Pamphylia being taken from it and made into a separate Province. Gradually certain additions were made, especially Paphlagonia in the north in 5 B.C., Komana Pontica (Pontus Galaticus) in 34, 35 A.D., Derbe and its neighbouring district in 41 A.D.

Thus when St Paul visited Antioch of Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra, Derbe, all these cities were in the Roman Province of Galatia.

(ii) Ancyra was the official capital of the Province, but Antioch a kind of secondary and military capital, situated as it was at the meeting-place of many roads.

3. *Its later history*[1]. In 74 A.D. (probably), Vespasian placed Galatia in some degree under Cappadocia, though they were still regarded as two Provinces, and detached from it Pisidia proper, but not, therefore, Antioch with its district. In 106 A.D. (probably), Trajan separated Galatia and Cappadocia again. About 137 A.D. some part of Lycaonia, including, as it seems, Derbe, but probably not Lystra, or Iconium and Antioch, was taken from Galatia. About 295 A.D. Diocletian divided the Province Galatia into two parts which answered roughly to the two halves of the kingdom conferred on Amyntas. 'One part was now called the Province Pisidia, and included Iconium, possibly also Lystra, parts of Asian Phrygia, all Pisidian

[1] See especially Ramsay, *Gal.* pp. 175 sqq.

Phrygia, and the northern parts of Pisidia proper. The other was called Galatia, and included the "Added Land" and a strip of Bithynian territory with the city of Juliopolis: it was nearly coextensive with the Galatia of King Deiotaros[1].'

CHAPTER II.

The Galatians of the Epistle—who were they?—Preliminary Questions.

1. *The terms 'Galatia' and 'Galatians.'* The short history of the Galatians and the Province called by their name will have suggested to the reader the possibility of much ambiguity in the term 'Galatia,' according to the meaning that it had at different times, and the connexion of thought with which it was employed at any time. It is therefore of primary importance to enquire into the sense in which St Paul was likely to have used it when writing to 'the churches of Galatia' (i. 2) and apostrophizing his readers as 'Galatians' (iii. 1). It is a question of extreme difficulty, upon which nevertheless deep feeling has been aroused, and there is therefore the more need of caution, and freedom from prejudice, in stating and estimating the evidence.

(i) *Literary usage.*

(*a*) It is convenient to mention here three passages in the Greek Bible.

(*a*) 1 Mac. viii. 1, 2. Judas Maccabaeus (*c.* 160 B.C.) 'heard of the fame of the Romans,...and they told him of their wars and exploits which they do among the Galatae, and how they conquered them, and brought them under tribute; and what things they did in the land of Spain.' It is possible that this refers to the expedition of Manlius against the Galatians in 189 B.C. (see p. xiv.), but he did not put them under tribute, and the mention of the conquest of Spain (201 B.C.), even though

[1] Ramsay, *ibid.* p. 178, who also mentions still later subdivisions and rearrangements.

exaggerated terms are used, points rather to the conquest of Cisalpine Gaul in 220 B.C.

(β) 2 Mac. viii. 20. Judas Maccabaeus recounts the help given by God to the Jews 'in the land of Babylon, even the battle that was fought against the Galatae.' Nothing is known about this engagement, but probably some Galatian troops from Asia Minor were employed in Babylon on one side or the other in a battle waged by Antiochus the Great (281—261 B.C.), and a victory was won against them by Jews.

(γ) 2 Tim. iv. 10. 'Demas...went to Thessalonica; Crescens to Galatia; Titus to Dalmatia.' If Timothy was in Asia Minor, as is probable, he would naturally think of the district nearest him, i.e. of Galatia in Asia Minor, but the Churches of Vienne and Mayence both claimed Crescens as their founder, and many fathers (Eusebius, Epiphanius, Jerome (?), Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret) explained this passage as referring to Western Gaul. Lightfoot gives some weight to this tradition because it is not the *primâ facie* view (see his *Galatians*, p. 31).

(*b*) Non-Biblical writers.

(*a*) Evidence of the employment of the terms in the wider and official sense.

(*aa*) It is probable that long before the establishment of the first Roman Province, and as far back as the time when Galatia was first recognized as 'a political fact, a definitely bounded country with its own form of government' (Ramsay, *Gal.* p. 81), i.e. after the victories of Attalus I between 240 and 230 B.C., its inhabitants were called Galatae whether they were strictly of Gallic birth or only Phrygians. Thus Manlius, 189 B.C. (see p. xiv.), sold no less than 40,000 captives into slavery besides the many thousands whom he slew (Livy, XXXVIII. 23); Lucullus (74 B.C.) had 30,000 troops of Galatae on active service when marching into Pontus, and perhaps an equal number must have been left to guard the country (Plutarch, *Lucullus*, 14). Again 'Galatae' appears to have been a very common designation for slaves (probably this is not unconnected

with Manlius' foray), if one may judge from the number of them enfranchised at Delphi[1]. It is probable that in all these cases Phrygians were included under the term Galatae if they came from the country known as Galatia.

(*bb*) After the Romans had formed Galatia into a Province many writers naturally used the term in the official sense.

So the elder Pliny (died 79 A.D.) speaks of Hydé, a town of eastern Lycaonia, as situated 'in confinio Galatiae atque Cappadociae' (*Hist. Nat.* v. 95), reckons the Lycaonian towns Lystra and Thebasa as belonging to Galatia (v. 147), and makes Cabalia and Milyas which were in the Province of Pamphylia be on the border of Galatia (*ibid.*). They were very far distant from Galatia proper.

So Tacitus (died 119 A.D.) by 'Galatia' clearly means the Province, and by 'Galatians' the inhabitants of the Province, e.g. 'Galatiam ac Pamphyliam provincias Calpurnio Asprenati regendas Galba permiserat' (*Hist.* II. 9), and 'Galatarum Cappadocumque auxilia' (*Ann.* XV. 6).

Ptolemy the geographer (*c.* 140 A.D.) describes Asia Minor according to its Provinces, and among them Galatia, with which he includes parts of Lycaonia, Pisidia and Isauria, and among other towns the Pisidian Antioch and Lystra (v. 4).

(*β*) Yet other writers use the terms in a purely geographical, i.e. the narrower and popular sense. Thus Strabo, a native of Pontus (about 54 B.C. to about 24 A.D.), during whose lifetime the Romans formed the Province, does not speak of Amyntas' dominions as 'Galatia,' but says 'Asia, which is on this side of the Halys and Mt Taurus, except the Galatians and the nations that were under Amyntas' (XVII. 3. 25). So too he writes, 'The Galatians took...what is now called Galatia and Gallograecia' (XII. 5. 1).

So too Memnon (floruit *c.* 140 A.D.), a native of Pontus, describing the coming of the Gauls to Asia Minor, writes, 'They cut off what is now called Galatia, apportioning it into three

[1] See references in Ramsay, *Gal.* pp. 79 sqq.

parts, to one giving the name of the Trokmi, to another that of the Tolistobogii, to another that of the Tectosages[1].'

Dio Cassius also (155—235 A.D.), born at Nicaea in Bithynia, but who lived long at Rome, becoming ultimately consul, writes about the formation of the Province, 'Galatia with Lycaonia received a Roman governor' (LIII. 26. 3), thus recognizing the two chief divisions of Amyntas' kingdom without adding any such explanation as would have been necessary if this narrower use of the term had not been well known to his readers.

So far then it has been seen that while some writers used the terms in the wider, and more particularly in the official, meaning, yet three others employed them in the narrower sense. It will have been noticed also that these three belonged by birth to Asia Minor, a coincidence which can hardly be accidental. It is possible that a fourth native of Asia Minor, Saul of Tarsus, would employ them in the same way.

(*c*) 1 Pet. i. 1. 'Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the elect who are sojourners of the Dispersion in Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia.'

It is generally, and perhaps rightly, assumed that all these names here mark Provinces, even though the one Province 'Pontus-Bithynia' is divided into its constituent parts, and in Cappadocia Province and district were practically conterminous. But in any case the position of Galatia between Pontus and Cappadocia suggests that only the northern, or rather the north-eastern, part of it was meant by St Peter[2].

The mention of Christians in north-eastern Galatia, of whose existence we know nothing in apostolic times, is not more

[1] Quoted by Steinmann, *Leserkreis*, p. 73, from Müller, *Fragmente*, III. p. 536 = XIX.

[2] 'The inland route intended to be taken by Silvanus can within moderate limits be conjectured with tolerable certainty. Of the vast province of Galatia the part to be visited between Pontus and Cappadocia could be only Galatia proper, the Galatia of St Paul's Epistles' (Hort, 1 *Pet.* pp. 183 sqq., cf. p. 158, *n.* 5, see also p. 17). Dr Hort delivered these lectures last in 1892, the year in which he died.

strange than the mention of Christians in Bithynia. Even in the case of Cappadocia we have only the allusion of Ac. ii. 9, and in that of Pontus (besides Ac. ii. 9 again) only the statement that Aquila was a Jew from that country, Ac. xviii. 2. Perhaps north and north-east Galatia formed a stepping-stone whereby the Gospel spread into Pontus on the one side and Cappadocia on the other.

(ii) *The evidence of the Inscriptions.* This, unfortunately, is singularly meagre.

A monument erected in Iconium during the reign either of Claudius or Nero to 'a Procurator of Caesar' designates his administrative district as 'the Galatian Province[1],' but this is only an example of quasi-official usage, proving indeed that Iconium was then in the Province of Galatia, but giving no information about the popular use of the term. It is the same with an inscription found at Antioch in Pisidia to Sospes a governor of Galatia[2], in which his rule is given as that of 'provinc. Gal. Pisid. Phryg.' (the abbreviation is doubtless 'provinciae' not 'provinciarum,' Pisidia and Phrygia being in apposition); but this too is an official, or quasi-official, inscription. More important is an inscription on a tomb found at Apollonia in the extreme west of the Province, some 50 miles beyond Antioch, where a citizen speaks in 222 A.D. of his city as his 'fatherland of the Galatians[3]' and mentions his son's career of honourable office among the noble Trokmians. A plausible explanation is that he was so accustomed to think of his city as Galatian, owing to it being in the Province of that name, that he poetically assigned to himself descent from the Gallic nobles. Yet it may be doubted whether persons dwelling in South Galatia, who (according to the manifold evidence adduced by Ramsay) were rather prone to pride themselves on their Greek culture and Roman citizenship, or at least their subservience to

[1] C. I. Gr. 3991.

[2] C. I. Lat. III. 291, corrected Suppl. 6818, cf. 6819.

[3] See Ramsay, *Studia Biblica*, IV. 53, and especially *Cities of St Paul*, 1907, pp. 351 sq.

Rome, would be likely to care to identify themselves with Galatians. It is much as though the Bavarians had been forcibly incorporated by an external power such as France into a Province named Prussia, and they eventually boasted of being descended from Junkers. It is more probable that there was some actual genealogical connexion between the inhabitants of Apollonia and the Galatians proper[1].

Judging therefore by the usage of literary writers, and the evidence of inscriptions, we conclude that no hard and fast rule existed with regard to the meaning attributed to 'Galatia' and 'Galatians,' during the first two centuries of our era, and that unless St Paul was for some special reason likely to use official terminology he would more probably use the terms in their more popular and narrow meaning, viz. of North Galatia, as we say, and its inhabitants.

(iii) It is said however that St Paul (unlike St Luke, who generally uses the popular names, see Zahn, *Einleitung*, I. 132, E. T. I. 186) always employed the official Roman terminology for districts and countries, and that therefore the terms 'Galatia' and 'Galatians' cannot refer only to North Galatia, but must refer to the Province of Galatia as such. But this statement is misleading. For in reality he mentions so few places (excluding towns), and his use of these is so uncertain, that we have not much material upon which to found a general rule.

The names arranged alphabetically are Achaia 7, Arabia 2, Asia 4, Cilicia 1, Dalmatia 1, Illyricum 1, Judaea 4, Macedonia 11 (14), Spain 2, Syria 1 and of course Galatia 3 (4).

Of these *Asia* has presumably the official sense of the kingdom bequeathed to Rome by Attalus III in 133 B.C. (i.e. including Mysia, Lydia, Caria, and great part of Phrygia, the Troad, and certain islands) for this appears to have been the ordinary nomenclature of the time. Yet St Luke uses it of a district excluding Phrygia, Mysia and the

[1] Compare the boast of a native of Antioch in Pisidia that he was a Magnesian of Phrygia, because Antioch was colonized from Magnesia on the Maeander (see Ramsay, *Galatians*, p. 201, *Cities of St Paul*, p. 260).

Troad (Ac. ii. 9, xvi. 6—8), just as the Letter of the Churches of Vienne and Lyons is written (A.D. 177) 'to the brethren throughout Asia and Phrygia' (Eus. *Ch. Hist.* v. i. 3), and as Tertullian writes (*c. Prax.* 1.), 'Ecclesiis Asiae et Phrygiae' (cf. Zahn, *Einleitung*, I. 132, E. T. I. 187).

Macedonia too may be deemed official, although the Churches there to which St Paul refers were all in old Macedonia, but he contrasts it with Achaia.

Achaia is more doubtful, for strictly speaking, in official, not only in popular, language, it did not include Athens[1]. Therefore while St Paul uses the term with official accuracy in 1 Cor. xvi. 15 (for we may assume that Stephanas was baptized at Corinth), he can hardly have done so in 2 Cor. i. 1 and other passages, unless he was excluding believers at Athens (Ac. xvii. 34).

Judaea too is doubtful. In 1 Thess. ii. 14, Rom. xv. 31 he speaks of the power and tyranny of the Jews there, certainly excluding therefore Samaria, and thinking of Jerusalem and its neighbourhood rather than Galilee. So also with Gal. i. 22 (see note). He therefore probably meant not the Roman prefecture but the popular division roughly conterminous with the old kingdom of Judah.

The cases of *Syria* and *Cilicia* go together, and the decision is the more difficult in that there is a slight doubt both about the text of i. 21 (see notes), and the official relation of Cilicia to Syria when St Paul was writing. It seems that at the time of the visit mentioned by him the two were regarded as one Province. But the article before Cilicia (which is almost certainly genuine) separates the two, and suggests that St Paul was using the popular rather than the official terminology.

Dalmatia (2 Tim. iv. 10†) was not used as an official name for a Province till 70 A.D. and there is no sufficient reason for doubting that St Paul used the term in a purely geographical sense.

[1] 'Athens was never placed under the fasces of the Roman governor, and never paid tribute to Rome; it always had a sworn alliance with Rome, and granted aid to the Romans only in an extraordinary and, at least as to form, voluntary fashion. The capitulation after the Sullan siege brought about doubtless a change in the constitution of the community, but the alliance was renewed.' 'These were the relations which the imperial government at its outset found existing in Greece, and in these paths it went forward' (Mommsen, *The Provinces of the Roman Empire*, E. T. 1886, I. pp. 258, 260). See further references in Steinmann, *Leserkreis*, p. 91.

Illyricum (Rom. xv. 19†). St Paul employs a form of the name which seems to be the transliteration of the Latin Illyricum, and is found elsewhere only in the writings of the Bithynian-Roman Dio Cassius (155—235 A.D.). It is therefore just possible that St Paul purposely employed this Roman official form in order to leave no doubt that he meant the Roman Province (of which the upper part was officially called Dalmatia from 70 A.D.), and not the country inhabited by Illyrians, which was wider than the Province. Josephus (*B. J.* II. 16. 4 [§ 369]) speaks of 'Illyrians' and 'Dalmatia' in a purely geographical sense; see also Appian, *Illyrica*, §§ 1, 11, and Strabo, VII. 7. 4. Marquardt says that 'the name Illyricum was used by the ancients as an ethnographical term for all cognate races which reach eastwards from the Alps to the exit of the Danube, and south from the Danube to the Adriatic and the Haemus range' (*Römische Staatsverwaltung*, 1873, I. p. 141, see also W. Weber, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Kaisers Hadrianus*, 1907, p. 55).

Arabia. See Appendix, Note A. It is probably a political term in i. 17, but in iv. 25 is rather a geographical expression.

Spain is completely indecisive, for the popular and the official names coincide. St Paul could not be expected to mention one or other of the three Provinces into which it was divided from the time of Augustus onward.

Thus of ten names (excluding Galatia), only one for certain (Asia), two probably (Macedonia and Illyricum), and one doubtfully (Achaia), are used in the Provincial sense; while one for certain (Dalmatia), one probably (Judaea), and two doubtfully (Syria and Cilicia), are used in the geographical sense; one (Arabia) in both senses; and one (Spain) in either sense. In fact, St Paul seems to have had no fixed rule, and to have used that name which was most readily understood, and best expressed his immediate purpose. His general practice therefore throws no light upon the meaning of his terms 'Galatia' and 'Galatians.' This must be determined by other means. We may grant that if he did wish to address the inhabitants of Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and even Derbe, he could employ 'Galatians' as a common appellation, but, thus far, there is no reason to think that he would do so.

(iv) 1 Cor. xvi. 1. It has been thought, that 1 Cor. xvi. 1

shows decisively that by 'Galatia' St Paul meant South Galatia. For he there refers to the Collection, which, it is probable, was being carried by those who were accompanying him to Jerusalem (Ac. xx. 4), among whom are mentioned Gaius of Derbe and Timothy. The inferences are drawn that these two represent the South Galatian Church and that delegates from North Galatia are not mentioned because no such Church existed.

But both inferences are unnecessary.

(*a*) There are grave difficulties in the opinion that Gaius and Timothy were delegates from South Galatia. Timothy had already been some time with St Paul, and Gaius is classed with him, so that presumably Gaius also had been in Macedonia. But if so why should the contribution from South Galatia have been sent so far round[1]? It is possible therefore that Gaius and Timothy acted as delegates not for South Galatia but for some other Church, e.g. Corinth or Philippi, for the delegates of these are not named. In any case the uncertainty of the text in Ac. xx. 5 ('had gone before,' R.V., or 'came,' R.V. marg.), and the ambiguity of 'these' prevent any clear deduction from the passage.

(*b*) If we are right (see pp. xxxvii. sq.) in placing our Epistle between 2 Cor. and Rom., then 1 Cor. was written before St Paul knew of the trouble in North Galatia, and it cannot be thought improbable that afterwards, at a time when the ill-feeling towards him was so high, the Christians there should have failed to send their contribution through him, if indeed they made one at all. St Paul, it will be noticed, has occasion to hint at their niggardliness (Gal. vi. 7).

2. *Did St Paul ever visit North Galatia?* This has been denied. It is therefore necessary to consider briefly two passages in the Acts.

[1] Dr Askwith (pp. 94 sq.) suggests that some of the delegates had been sent forward by St Paul to tell those in Asia of his change of route, and that others had gone on earlier and separately, but this is hypothesis on hypothesis.

(i) Ac. xvi. 6. St Paul had proposed to Barnabas that they should revisit the brethren in every city where they had preached the word of the Lord (xv. 36), but had finally started on his second Missionary Journey alone with Silas as his attendant, and had passed through Syria and Cilicia confirming the Churches (xv. 40, 41). He had then come as far as Derbe and Lystra, had taken Timothy, of whom he received a good account from brethren in Lystra and Iconium, and they went through the cities, and the Churches were established. The words evidently include Antioch in Pisidia as well as the other three cities (xvi. 1—5). St Paul and Silas then intended to go to Asia, apparently as far as Ephesus, but, as they were prevented in this by the Holy Ghost[1], they passed through, in the words of the A.V., 'Phrygia and the region of Galatia,' or of the R.V., 'the region of Phrygia and Galatia,' i.e. they turned off northwards, coming at last opposite Mysia, and intending to enter Bithynia. The difference of the R.V. from the A.V. is caused by the absence in the true Greek text of the article before the adjective 'Galatic.' If, indeed, 'Phrygia' be a substantive (xviii. 23), we must translate, 'Now they passed through Phrygia and (some) Galatic district,' i.e. part of country belonging to Galatia. But this is awkward, and a substantive is not found joined with an adjective ('Galatic'), both defining a common term. Probably, in accordance with classical usage, P. is an adjective, and we must translate, 'Now they passed through

[1] Although Ac. xii. 4, xxv. 13 adduced by Dr Askwith (pp. 39—42) show that it may be just possible to understand the participle translated in the R.V. 'having been forbidden' predicatively to 'they went through' (when it would fail to show whether the prohibition came before or after the journey through 'Phrygia and the region of Galatia'), it is extremely unnatural to do so. Moulton's words are hardly too strong: 'On the whole case, we may safely accept the vigorous statement of Schmiedel on Ac. xvi. 6 (*Enc. Bib.* c. 1599): "It has to be maintained that the participle must contain, if not something antecedent to 'they went,' at least something synchronous with it, in no case a thing subsequent to it, if all the rules of grammar and all sure understanding of language are not to be given up"' (*Prolegomena*, 1906, p. 134).

the district of P. and G.,' the article summing up under one head the district actually traversed[1]. Perhaps, as Zahn thinks, St Luke deliberately chose the phrase in contrast to 'Galatia' or 'the Galatic Province,' and meant by it the country of the Galatae strictly so called (*Einl.* I. 133, E. T. I. 188). They would appear to have gone by Prymnessus to Nacoleia, or even to Pessinus (for to St Luke 'Asia' was smaller than the Roman Province of that name, see pp. xxi. sq.), or they may have gone to Amorium (either by Prymnessus or even round by Thymbrium Hadrianopolis) and so to Pessinus, and then to Dorylaeum, close to both Mysia and Bithynia. They thus passed through a portion of North Galatia.

It should be noted that Zahn (*Einl.* I. 133—136, E. T. I. 187—191) vigorously defends the fact of this visit to N. Galatia, even though he thinks the Epistle was written primarily to S. Galatia.

(ii) Ac. xviii. 23 says of the beginning of the third Missionary Journey that St Paul 'passed through in order "the Galatic region and Phrygia" confirming all the disciples.' Here 'Phrygia' is clearly enough a substantive, and it describes a district westward of 'the Galatic region,' a phrase which is explained by

[1] An attempt has been made to give 'region' an official meaning here, but one is not justified in departing from its ordinary sense (e.g. 1 Mac. viii. 8, x. 38, xii. 25) except on clear evidence. To translate 'the Phrygian-Galatic Region,' explaining it of an official district reckoned to Phrygia ethnically and Galatia politically, is indeed singularly attractive, but lacks any direct confirmation. On supposed other evidence, see Addenda, p. xii. Harnack thinks that 'region' in the Acts (except xii. 20) marks the countryside in contrast to towns, and that in Acts xvi. 6, xviii. 23 St Luke says '(the) Galatian region' 'because Galatia was poor in cities.' He also clearly accepts the North Galatian theory (*Acts*, E. T. 1909, pp. 57 sq., 101). It has been argued (Ramsay, *Church in Rom. Emp.* pp. 80 sq.) that the adjective 'Galatic' is used of what was properly and previously not belonging to Galatia, cf. Pontus Galaticus, and if it were probable that 'region' were a region officially this might be important. But such a limitation of 'Galatic' would appear to lie not in the word itself, but in the substantive to which it is attached.

Ac. xvi. 6, i.e. the district of Galatia already visited. St Paul, that is to say, is revisiting the converts of North Galatia and Phrygia, and joins the road to Ephesus perhaps at Eumeneia, continuing his journey viâ Tralla and the Cayster valley (Ac. xix. 1), thus avoiding both the Churches in South Galatia and the town of Colossae (Col. ii. 1), and presumably Laodicea (Acts xix. 1).

3. *The cause of St Paul's preaching to the Galatians.* He says that it was 'on account of infirmity of the flesh' (iv. 13). Illness, that is to say, made him stay in Galatia, and his illness was a trial to the Galatians, which, notwithstanding, they wholly overcame (iv. 14). It probably also affected his eyes (iv. 15). Ramsay urges that it was malaria caught in the low-lying districts of Pamphylia, and that he went to the highlands of South Galatia to recover from it. He also connects it, somewhat gratuitously, with the 'stake in the flesh' (2 Cor. xii. 7), saying that in malaria 'apart from the weakness and ague, the most trying and painful accompaniment is severe headache,' and quotes a South African author who speaks of 'the grinding, boring pain in one temple, like the dentist's drill' (*Gal.* pp. 424 sq.). But it is questionable whether the effects of malaria would last as long as the greater part (at least) of St Paul's first visit to South Galatia, at the same time leaving him free to preach with the energy described in Acts xiii. and xiv., and in any case it is hard to imagine that St Mark would have deserted him in such a state. St Mark may have been homesick and cowardly, but he cannot have been brutal. It is easier to suppose that illness was the physical cause why St Paul turned northwards instead of going on towards Ephesus, and that the historian, seeing the blessing to which it ultimately led, stated the spiritual side of it in the words 'being prevented by the Holy Spirit from preaching the word in Asia' (Ac. xvi. 6). But perhaps the illness was only the cause of delay and so of preaching, rather than of the route taken, and this is strictly the statement of iv. 13.

4. 'The first time,' R.V., iv. 13. The Greek term can hardly

mean 'long ago' (see notes), and probably implies that St Paul had visited his readers twice, but not more than twice. If therefore they belonged to South Galatia the Epistle must be placed not later than in the very beginning of his third Missionary Journey. See further, pp. xxxiv. sq.

5. ii. 5, 'that the truth of the gospel might continue with *you*.' 'You' has been thought to prove decisively the South Galatian theory (Zahn, *Einleitung*, I. 126, 137 sq., E.T. I. 178, 193), for St Paul is referring to the Council in Acts xv. (see Appendix, Note B), and at that time he had not visited North Galatia. But the aim of his conflict for Christian liberty was that the truth of the Gospel might continue with any converts of any time, to whom he might be writing in the hope of warding off attacks made on their Christian freedom. Thus 'you' refers directly to the Galatian readers, even though they were not necessarily converted before the Council (see notes).

Thus far the weight of the evidence in these preliminary questions appears to be in favour of the North Galatian theory. We turn now to evidence of other kinds.

CHAPTER III.

THE GALATIANS OF THE EPISTLE—WHO WERE THEY? (cont.). EVIDENCE ADDUCED IN FAVOUR OF EITHER THEORY.

HAVING considered certain preliminary questions we may turn to the direct evidence adduced in favour of either theory.

1. Considerations urged in support of the theory that the Epistle was addressed to Churches in South Galatia, i.e. to those mentioned in Acts xiii., xiv.

(i) *Generally.* (*a*) *It is improbable that Churches whose foundation is described at so much length should be entirely passed over in the Epistles of St Paul*, save when he reminds Timothy of the sufferings of those early days (2 Tim. iii. 11),

although he was their joint founder with Barnabas, and afterwards took a warm interest in them (Ac. xvi. 1—5).

(*α*) He addressed no Epistle to them. This however is of little weight, for the reason of the preservation of his Epistles lies, it would seem, not in the importance of the Churches addressed (witness Colossians), but in the specific character of the contents. He might have written repeatedly to the Churches of South Galatia, and none of his letters would be extant, unless it contained teaching of importance not found elsewhere.

(*β*) He nowhere alludes to them. For 1 Cor. xvi. 1 must go with the interpretation given to Gal. i. 2, iii. 1. This is certainly not what we should have expected, but *a priori* arguments are proverbially dangerous.

(*b*) *The Churches in South Galatia were more prominent in early Church history than those of North Galatia.*

The Thekla legend of the 2nd century speaks with some accuracy of Antioch, Lystra, Iconium, and perhaps also Derbe, and the Churches of South Galatia were active in the 3rd century. But we do not hear of a Christian community in North Galatia before the time of Apolinarius of Hierapolis, not later than 192 A.D. (at Ancyra, Eusebius, *Ch. Hist.* v. 16. 4), and the next witness is the Synod of Ancyra, 314 A.D. It may be noted that Ramsay in the *Expos. Times* for Nov. 1909 (pp. 64 sqq.) calls attention to 'a martyrdom on a large scale under Domitian or Trajan or Hadrian' at Ancyra in North Galatia. It seems improbable that none of the martyrs came from the neighbourhood of the official capital of the Province, even though the chief martyr Gaianus may perhaps have belonged to Barata in Lycaonia (Gaianoupolis), 'which was included in the Province Galatia until the latter part of Hadrian's reign.'

But this is another form of the preceding argument of the importance of the Churches of South Galatia. The Church of Colossae was less important than those of North Galatia, and yet St Paul wrote to it.

(ii) *The contents of the Epistle correspond to what we are told elsewhere of the Churches in South Galatia.*

(*a*) Most of the converts were Gentiles (ii. 5, iv. 8, v. 2, vi. 12, and the subject of the Epistle), but some were Jews (iii. 27—29) and many must have been well acquainted with Jewish modes of exposition (iv. 22—31). So in South Galatia most of the converts were Gentiles, but some were Jews (Ac. xiii. 43, xiv. 1), for in Antioch and Iconium there were synagogues. Non-Biblical writings and inscriptions bear out the presence of Jews in South Galatia, and there is hardly any evidence for the presence of Jews in North Galatia. On the other hand converts who were accustomed to Jews, and Jewish thoughts, would not be so liable to be led astray by Judaizing Christians as were those to whom the claims of Judaism were new. The north of Galatia was more virgin soil for the propagation of Jewish error than the south.

(*b*) Barnabas. His prominence in the Epistle (ii. 1, 9, 13) suits the fact that he was with St Paul in Ac. xiii. and xiv. But, on the other hand, in those chapters of Acts he is placed very nearly on an equality with St Paul in his evangelistic work, and in the Epistle St Paul implies that he himself, if not quite alone (i. 8, 9), was yet so much alone as to deem his associates of little importance (iv. 11—20). This would be very suitable if they were only Silas and Timothy (see i. 8 note).

If the Epistle was addressed to South Galatia Barnabas must have taken a much smaller part in the evangelization of that district than St Luke's narrative implies, even though we read that at Lystra St Paul was 'the chief speaker.' But probably St Paul mentions him both here and in 1 Cor. ix. 6, Col. iv. 10 for the sole reason that he was of high repute among Jewish as well as among Gentile converts.

(*c*) iv. 14, 'Ye received me as an angel of God.' It is suggested that this refers to the fact that the men of Lystra called St Paul Hermes—the messenger of the gods—because he was the chief speaker (Ac. xiv. 12). But in our Epistle he is so received *in spite of his illness*, which is quite contrary to the

impression given by the Acts. Probably the coincidence is accidental, though it may well represent a half unconscious contrast to i. 8.

The phrase in the Acts of Thekla, § 3, that St Paul's appearance was sometimes that of an angel is doubtless due to a reminiscence of this passage, and not to an independent tradition of the Pisidian Antioch. See further in the notes.

(*d*) It is said that the insistence on freedom in the Epistle was peculiarly suitable to the spirit of the South Galatians; that they were in touch with the Graeco-Roman culture of the time and were feeling their way to independence of thought; that, on the other hand, little evidence of this in North Galatia has survived; that the inhabitants were in a lower stage of culture and would not appreciate so readily the Greek spirit underlying our Epistle.

But it may be replied that anyone could appreciate the idea of freedom in contrast to slavery. The freedom taught by St Paul was not peculiarly Greek. Slavery existed in North Galatia as well as in the South, and also, whatever the official religion of North Galatia may have been, it is unlikely that the various forms of mysteries which honeycombed Asia Minor, and taught liberty of spirit from sin and death, were absent there. Neither the Phrygians nor their influence had died out (compare p. xiv.).

(*e*) More important are the references in the Epistle to legal customs. This is a very intricate subject, warmly debated, and is discussed summarily in the Appendix, Note C. Here it must be sufficient to say that the result seems to be indecisive. They could have been made in a letter to either North or South Galatians.

(*f*) Ramsay (*Gal.* pp. 399—401) is fully justified in his endeavour to strengthen his theory by appealing to the points in common between St Paul's address in Antioch of Pisidia (Ac. xiii. 16—41) and our Epistle, on the ground that St Paul desires to recall instruction already given; for there are, doubtless, some striking coincidences between the two (see iv. 4, note on 'sent forth').

But certain considerations may not be overlooked. (*a*) The greater part of the address, stating how 'the history of the Jews becomes intelligible only as leading onward to a further development and to a fuller stage,' though it may be illustrated by our Epistle, is common to the Apostolic way of preaching the Gospel. It is that of St Peter (Ac. iii. 12—26) and St Stephen (Ac. vii.). No doubt St Paul also frequently employed it in controversy with Jews, or persons exposed to Jewish influence. (*β*) Typically Pauline phraseology occurs only in one verse (*v.* 39) and is not peculiar to our Epistle. (*γ*) The use of 'tree' (Ac. xiii. 29 and Gal. iii. 13), meaning the Cross, would be more noticeable if it were not also employed by St Peter (Ac. v. 30, x. 39; 1 Pet. ii. 24). We regard the coincidences as evidence that St Paul's teaching never changed essentially, but as insufficient to outweigh the many probabilities that the Epistle was written to the inhabitants of North Galatia.

2. *Evidence in support of the opinion that the Epistle was addressed to the Churches of North Galatia.*

i. *Patristic.* This is unanimous[1]. It is true that after 295 A.D. North Galatia alone was officially called Galatia (*vide supra*, p. xvi.), but Origen lived before then, and wrote lengthy commentaries on our Epistle, which Jerome took as his guide, making use also of other writers[2]. Thus probably both Jerome

[1] Ramsay (*Stud. Bibl.* IV. pp. 16 sqq.) urges that as Asterius, Bishop of Amaseia in Pontus, 401 A.D., explains 'the Galatic region and Phrygia' (Ac. xviii. 23) as 'Lycaonia and the cities of Phrygia,' and as Lycaonia was no longer included in Galatia in his time, he 'was brought up to the South Galatian theory as the accepted tradition.' But Asterius is evidently an inaccurate person, for he confounds Antioch of Syria with Antioch in Pisidia, and it is probable that he has mixed up the first with the second Missionary Journey (see Steinmann, *Leserkreis*, p. 187, Zahn, *Einl.* I. 135, E. T. I. 190).

[2] 'Quin potius in eo, ut mihi videor, cautior atque timidior, quod imbecillitatem virium mearum sentiens, Origenis Commentarios sum sequutus. Scripsit enim ille vir in Epistolam Pauli ad Galatas quinque proprie volumina, et decimum Stromatum suorum librum commatico super explanatione ejus sermone complevit: Tractatus quoque varios,

and others who place the readers in North Galatia derived their opinion from him. Again, as Origen's works were used so freely it is most unlikely that if he had held the South Galatian theory all trace of his opinion should have been lost. Further, the greater the power of the South Galatian Churches (p. xxix.) the less likely is it that the fact that our Epistle was addressed to them should have died out so completely.

ii. If the Epistle was written after the beginning of the third Missionary Journey (*vide infra*, p. xxxv.) it is most improbable that St Paul should have addressed the South Galatians alone as Galatians, for then there were other believers in North Galatia (*vide supra*, pp. xxv. sq.), but he could well address the North Galatians alone by that title, treating Galatia as a geographical, not a political, expression, especially if, as it seems, Schmiedel is right in saying that 'only in North Galatia was to be found the people who had borne that name from of old, and in common speech, not only in official documents' (*Encyc. Bib.* c. 1614, and see above pp. xviii. sq.). It is, further, impossible that the Epistle can have been addressed to both districts (as Zahn once supposed), for its readers are clearly connected, both by their past history and by their present condition.

Observe that the Churches of North Galatia had at least as much in common as those of South Galatia. For there was a much greater mixture of races in the South than in the North[1].

Taking into consideration all the various parts of the evidence adduced we are of opinion that the patristic belief is, after all, right, and that St Paul's readers lived in North Galatia.

et Excerpta, quae vel sola possint sufficere, composuit. Praetermitto Didymum, videntem meum, et Laodicenum de Ecclesia nuper egressum, et Alexandrum veterem haereticum, Eusebium quoque Emesenum, et Theodorum Heracleoten, qui et ipsi nonnullos super hac re Commentariolos reliquerunt.' *Praef. in Ep. ad Gal.*, Vallarsi, VII. 369.

[1] Lightfoot urges repeatedly that the emotional and changeable character of the readers suits the North Galatians as Celts, but this argument is justly discredited as fanciful.

CHAPTER IV.

The Time of Writing.

If the Epistle was addressed to North Galatia, as we have seen is probably the case, it must have been written after the beginning of the third Missionary Journey, but it is nevertheless convenient to state succinctly the various opinions of its date, and also it is necessary to try to define the time more accurately.

1. Upon any theory that is even approximately sound it must be between the Council at Jerusalem, A.D. 49 (51), and St Paul's imprisonment at Caesarea, A.D. 56 (58). The later limit is not seriously contradicted[1]. It is determined by the absence of all reference to his imprisonment, as well as by the difference of the contents of the Epistle from the group of Philippians, Colossians and Ephesians with Philemon. The earlier limit has been denied (in England especially by Mr D. Round[2]), but on insufficient grounds. The evidence that it was written after the Council is briefly:

i. Gal. ii. 1—10 almost certainly refers to the visit by St Paul to Jerusalem at the time of the Council. See Appendix, Note B.

ii. Gal. iv. 13, 'the first time' (see pp. xxvii. sq. and notes) refers to the former of two visits already paid, and before the Council he had visited no part of the Province of Galatia more than once. It has been argued indeed that St Paul's visit to the Pisidian Antioch, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe described in Ac. xiii.—xiv.

[1] According to the subscription of the Received Text, following correctors of B, and KLP with some cursives, the two Syriac, and the Memphitic versions, it was written from Rome. So also Theodoret, while Eusebius of Emesa (c. 350 A.D.) and Jerome place it during an imprisonment of St Paul, without further definition.

[2] *The Date of St Paul's Epistle to the Galatians.* Cambridge, 1906. See Addenda, p. xii.

20 was the first visit to which St Paul here refers, and his return journey (Ac. xiv. 21—23) from Derbe to Lystra, Iconium and Antioch was his second. But in any case this excludes Derbe from a second visit, and allows a very short time, hardly more than six months at the most, between the two visits to even Antioch. 'The first time' suggests a longer interval and a more distinct visit.

2. *Dates affixed by those who uphold the South Galatian theory.*

i. The letter was written very soon after his second visit in 49 (51) A.D. ending with Ac. xvi. 6 (on his second Missionary Journey), and perhaps from Corinth, in which case it may well be the earliest of all his Epistles that have come down to us (so Zahn, *Einleitung*, I. 141, E. T. I. 198). On the psychological improbability of this see below (pp. xxxvi. sq.).

ii. It was written from Antioch in Syria some three years after the Council of Jerusalem, just before the beginning of the third Missionary Journey, Acts xviii. 22, i.e. 52 (54) A.D. (so Ramsay, *Paul the Traveller*, p. 191). Against this is St Paul's statement (iv. 20) that he cannot come to them, if, as Ramsay holds, he visited them immediately afterwards.

iii. Observe that for those who hold the South Galatian theory it cannot have been written during or after the third Missionary Journey, for (*a*) if Ac. xviii. 23 refers to South Galatia St Paul would have visited it a third time, contrary to Gal. iv. 13 (*vide supra*), and (*b*) if to his second visit to North Galatia (as is probable, see pp. xxvi. sq.) he could not have written 'unto the churches of Galatia' with reference to the Churches of South Galatia only[1]. While, further, the unity of the readers forbids the supposition that it was addressed to both North and South Galatia.

[1] It is true that certain eminent writers think it was written to S. Galatia and yet place it early or late in the third Missionary Journey. But to do so they deny either the probable meaning of 'the first time' or the fact that St Paul visited N. Galatia.

3. *Dates upon the North Galatian theory.*

Upon the North Galatian theory the Epistle was written after St Paul's second visit (Ac. xviii. 23) and during his third Missionary Journey. But this lasted nearly three years. Is it possible to determine the date more closely?

i. It was written at the beginning of St Paul's three years' stay in Ephesus, A.D. 52 (54) (Schmiedel). This was said to be a traditional view by Victorinus c. 370 A.D. So also the Prologues of the best MSS. of the Vulgate, Amiatinus and Fuldensis (Zahn, *Einleitung*, I. 141, E. T. I. 199). 'So quickly' (i. 6) has been thought to require this, but the phrase rather refers to the rapidity with which the erroneous teaching was accepted, not to the brevity of the time since St Paul had seen the Galatians (see notes). Also this date places our Epistle at a greater distance from 1 and 2 Cor. and Rom. than the relation between the four Epistles warrants.

ii. For this relation is marked by much common matter and tone of both thought and language. This indeed is granted by all, but it has been urged that it proves little, for St Paul must have held his opinions about Justification and the Law immediately after his conversion, and especially about the time of the Council of Jerusalem. This is true, but it is more probable that St Paul used the same language and arguments in 1 and 2 Cor. and Rom. because his mind was full of them at the time, than that after some years he fell back upon old formulae used already in Gal. To place 1 and 2 Cor. and Rom. at a distance in time from Gal. is to question St Paul's readiness of language and wealth of argument[1].

[1] This applies of course with double force to that form of the S. Galatian theory which places our Epistle soon after St Paul's second visit to S. Galatia and thus makes it the earliest of all his Epistles.

Prof. Milligan writes with almost too much restraint: 'If such resemblances in language and thought are to be reckoned with, how are we to explain the fact that in the Thessalonian Epistle, written,

iii. Further, we see that our Epistle most resembles 2 Cor. (especially cc. x.—xiii.) and Rom. The evidence (stated at some length by Lightfoot, *Gal.* pp. 42—56, and by Salmon in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, 2nd edition, I. pp. 1108 sqq.) is on the following lines[1].

(*a*) The intense personal feeling of 'pain at ill-returned affection' (Salmon) due to a movement against his own position and authority introduced among his converts by outsiders: *passim* in both Gal. and 2 Cor., but especially compare

Gal. i. 6 *with* 2 Cor. xi. 4.
„ i. 1 „ „ xii. 12.
„ iv. 16 „ „ xii. 15.

(*b*) Statements dealing with the relation of Gentile converts to the Law.

(*α*) His opponents are Judaizers, Gal. (*passim*), 2 Cor. xi. 22.

(*β*) The arguments of Gal. are expanded in Rom.

The following examples may suffice:

(1) Justification not from the law but by faith.
Gal. ii. 16. Rom. iii. 19—26.

(2) By means of the law death to the law and life in Christ.
Gal. ii. 19. Rom. vii. 4—6.

according to most of the supporters of this view, very shortly after Galatians, there is an almost complete absence of any trace of the distinctive doctrinal positions of that Epistle? No doubt the differences in the circumstances under which the two Epistles were written, and the particular ends they had in view, may account for much of this dissimilarity. At the same time, while not psychologically impossible, it is surely most unlikely that the same writer—and he too a writer of St Paul's keen emotional nature—should show no signs in this (according to this view) later Epistle of the conflict through which he had just been passing, and on which he had been led to take up so strong and decided a position' (*The Epistles to the Thessalonians*, pp. xxxvi. sq.).

[1] The student is earnestly advised to read Galatians and immediately afterwards 1 and 2 Cor. and Rom., marking for himself points of resemblance. For the more these Epistles are compared, the deeper is the impression made by the details in which resemblance is seen.

(3) Crucified with Christ, the believer lives.
Gal. ii. 20. Rom. vi. 6—11.

(4) Abraham the example of faith, and believers are sons of Abraham.
Gal. iii. 6—9. Rom. iv. 1—3, 9—25.

(5) The old slavery and the new freedom.
Gal. iv. 7—9. Rom. vi. 16—22.

(6) Isaac the true seed of Abraham.
Gal. iv. 23, 28. Rom. ix. 7—9.

(7) Love the fulfilment of the law.
Gal. v. 14. Rom. xiii. 8—10.

(8) The Spirit gives victory over sin.
Gal. v. 16, 17. Rom. viii. 4—11

(*c*) *Words and phrases.*

(*α*) Peculiar to the four Epistles, though not necessarily in each of these. Observe especially: 'anathema,' 'freedom' and its cognates in reference to spiritual freedom.

(*β*) Peculiar in St Paul's Epistles to Gal. and 2 Cor.: 'a new creature' (or 'creation'), 'devour.'

Compare also Gal. iii. 3 *with* 2 Cor. viii. 6.
" " " iii. 13 " " v. 21.

(*γ*) Peculiar in St Paul's Epistles to Gal. and Rom., or almost so: e.g. 'justify' (Gal. 8, Rom. 15, 1 Cor. 2, Pastoral Epp. 2); 'Abba, Father'; 'heir' (Pastoral Epp. 1). A full list is given by Lightfoot, *Gal.* p. 48.

Probably therefore our Epistle was written soon after 2 Cor. either in the autumn of 55 (57) A.D. from Macedonia, or a little later, during the early part of St Paul's three months' stay in Corinth in the winter of 55, 56 (57, 58), near the end of which he wrote the Epistle to the Romans[1].

[1] It may be pointed out that our Epistle, on the date here ascribed to it, contributes, with 2 Cor., to the elucidation of two important parts of St Paul's address to the elders at Miletus (Acts xx. 17—35), delivered only a very few months later.

Probably the first impression received from a perusal of that address

CHAPTER V.

The danger to which the Galatians were exposed, and the manner in which St Paul met it.

Some three years had elapsed since St Paul had visited his converts in North Galatia. His first stay among them (Ac. xvi. 6, A.D. 50 (52)) had been caused by illness (iv. 13, 14) of a kind to make his message repulsive to them, but, notwithstanding, they had eagerly accepted it, and had been ready to give themselves up in any way for his sake (iv. 15). His second visit (Ac. xviii. 23, A.D. 52 (54)) had also been satisfactory, but he had had occasion to warn them against certain Jewish Christians who preached elsewhere a false form of Christianity (i. 9, iv. 16).

But now in 55—56 (57—58) A.D. he has recently heard of the effect of this Jewish-Christian teaching on a Church as far distant as Corinth (2 Cor. xi. 4), and he can have had no hope that the false teachers would neglect any place where he had made converts, even though it were somewhat away from the greater lines of communication. But he is surprised to learn, perhaps from representatives of the Galatian Churches (cf. Zahn, *Einleitung*,

is the strangeness of the fact that St Paul should say so much about himself. The subject of *vv.* 18—21 is that of his own efforts and trials at Ephesus, and he returns to it in *vv.* 26, 27, 31. Why does he lay so much stress on this? 2 Cor. and Gal. supply the answer. His authority and the sincerity of his work had recently been seriously called in question. It is impossible that the Ephesian Church should not have heard of this attack, and not have been exposed to it. He therefore recalls to the elders how much the believers at Ephesus owe to him.

Again, St Paul insists on the danger of covetousness, and the duty of caring for others, not only the sick but also ministers of the word (*vv.* 33—35). It is worthy of notice that in Gal. vi. 6—10 St Paul calls the attention of his readers to the same duty.

I. 120, E.T. I. 169), that they have acquired much influence over his converts in Galatia (i. 6 sqq.), and that very quickly.

1. *The danger.* It is easy to account for the feelings of the Jewish party among these early Christians. They had been brought up as Jews and had accepted Jesus as the Messiah, but they had not entered into the far-reaching results of His teaching or perceived the effect of His death. St Stephen indeed had pointed out the ultimate tendencies, but if some of them heard his speech they can hardly have approved of all of it. In any case they welcomed Gentile converts, but only on condition that these in accepting the Messiah accepted also the preparation for Messiah, and placed themselves under the enactments and practices of the Law of Moses, not only in such lesser points as the observance of seasons (iv. 9 sq.), but also in so fundamental a matter as circumcision itself. This was to be not only a means of perfection (as in the later example of the false teachers at Colossae), but an indispensable means of acquiring salvation. Their argument was: if no Law, then no Christ, for only the Law guaranteed the obtaining of blessing through Christ, and therefore to omit the Law meant to be without the blessing.

It was true, they said, that Paul taught otherwise. But who was Paul? He had no knowledge of Christ at first hand. He was inferior to the Twelve, who had been with Him for three years, and themselves observed the Law. It was not likely that they would countenance the admission of Gentiles unless these observed it also. The Church at Jerusalem was the true model.

These false teachers, it will be noticed, ignored the Council of Jerusalem[1]. They also said that St Paul pleased men, in other

[1] It is possible that the original form of the Decree did not contain the prohibition to eat unclean meats (see Harnack, *Acts*, E.T. 1909, pp. 248—268). Observe that St Paul does not hint that the Council had taken place recently, e.g. by implying that his adversaries would not have claimed the Twelve on their side if they had known what took place at the Council. His language rather suggests that it had been held some years before the present letter.

words chose the easiest way for Gentiles in order to gain them (i. 10).

2. *The manner in which St Paul deals with the danger.*

i. He sees the vital importance of this false teaching. It is in fact a different kind of gospel altogether; let anyone who preaches this be anathema (i. 8, 9); and it is a return to old ways once left (ii. 18, iii. 2 sq., iv. 8—11). It depends ultimately on the performance of good works; it misunderstands the very Law which it purposes to uphold, and the religion of Abraham whose followers these Jewish Christians claim to be.

These men are fascinating you, as with the evil eye, so that you are turning away your gaze from the lifelike portraiture of Christ Jesus (iii. 1) on the cross, with all that the cross means as the single instrument of salvation. They want you to follow them that they may boast over you—over your very circumcision in the flesh (vi. 12).

ii. The true Gospel, on the other hand, lies in the reception of salvation and life as a free gift from God. These are bound up with Christ and with Christ alone, apart from the Law and its requirements (ii. 20). Abraham lived by faith (iii. 8, 9), and the promise to him is earlier than the Law, and is not overridden by it (iii. 15—18).

The Law, so far from guaranteeing life in Christ, produces death (iii. 10 sq.), and was given to convict of sin and lead men to enjoy the promise by faith on Christ alone (iii. 19—22). The Law was only for a time, Christ redeemed us and gave us the adoption of sons (iv. 1—7). The Law led us to Christ and leaves us with Him (iii. 23—25), all, whatever their nationality or position, being sons of God by faith in Christ Jesus, for being Christ's we get the promise made to Abraham (iii. 26—29). The Law itself tells us that *freedom* is the characteristic of each true son of Abraham (iv. 21 sqq.); therefore stand in your freedom and do not be entangled in bondage again (v. 1). Circumcision pledges you to do the whole Law—and if circumcised you fall from Christ. For really circumcision and uncircumcision are

nothing; the one thing of importance is faith worked by love (v. 2—6).

iii. Again, he defends his own position. (*a*) I have no authority! True, not from man nor by any one man, but my authority comes direct from Christ and God the Father (i. 1) So too my Gospel is not after any human standard but was revealed to me by Jesus Christ (i. 11, 12). For He was revealed to me at my conversion near Damascus (i. 16). God chose me and called and sent me forth to preach Him, and He has blessed my work (i. 15, 16). From the first I acted independently of the Twelve (i. 17) and the Churches of Judaea (i. 22). But the Twelve acknowledged me (ii. 8 sqq.), and Cephas himself yielded at my public rebuke for not upholding the Gospel life and practice in its simplicity (ii. 11—14).

(*b*) I am inconsistent, am I? Yes with what I was as a Jew. For I once persecuted the Church, but I am not inconsistent since my conversion. I do not try to please men *now* (i. 10). I never had a Gentile convert circumcised, no not even Titus (ii. 4). If I preach circumcision still why should Jews persecute me (v. 11)?

(*c*) You loved me once (iv. 12—15)—and you know that I loved you—yea whatever they say (iv. 16) I do love you now (iv. 19). It is not a matter of any self-glorying with me. Christ's cross, with all it brings of suffering and shame, is my glory (vi. 14). To be a new creature in Christ is the one and only matter of importance—therein lies membership in the true Israel (vi. 15, 16).

CHAPTER VI.

The Permanent Value of the Epistle.

The Epistle was not only of value for the time in which it was written and for the readers to whom it was first addressed. It also sets before Christians of all time and every place, in a more concise, even if in a more controversial, form than does the

Epistle to the Romans, the essential teaching of the Gospel of Christ, namely that Life in Him is not of works but of faith.

That there is a tendency in human nature to forget this is shown by the history of the Church. For the development of Church doctrine too often has been not on the lines laid down by St Paul, but on others more agreeable to human nature in its present state. Christian writers and teachers have been prone to make much of the ability to perform good works which have in themselves the power of rendering us acceptable to God. It is true indeed that such writers avoided Jewish terms (for the Christian Fathers always had a horror of any return to Judaism and so far St Paul accomplished his immediate aim), but many taught doctrine that gave nearly as much weight to works as did that of the Jews themselves. They were of course careful, as even are thoughtful Jews to-day, to avoid attributing merit to works as such, apart from the spirit in which they are performed, but although they ascribed in theory the virtue of merit to good works only in so far as these were performed by the aid of the grace of God in Christ, yet in practice this came to mean all good works performed by professing Christians. Hence it often came about that while Churchmen were asserting in words that they were saved by their faith in Christ, they trusted in reality to their own good works.

It would be easy to show that this trust was no solitary example of mistaken interpretation of Gospel requirements, but rather was vitally connected with the introduction of non-Christian methods of thought into the Church. For it was only one of the many signs that heathenism was corrupting the simplicity of the Gospel[1], and that Christians were falling away into laxity of ethical life as well as into error of doctrine.

It is not therefore strange that revivals in ethical life on any large scale have always been due to a return to the first principles

[1] Prof. Orr speaks of 'the inevitable blunting of Pauline ideas in their passing over to the Gentile world, imperfectly prepared, through lack of a training under the Law, to receive them' (*The Progress of Dogma*, 1901, p. 248).

of St Paul's teaching, with the consequent acceptance of Christ as the immediate source of spiritual life, apart from, and anterior to, good works. This was the secret of the greater part of Augustine's power. This was that which gave Luther his personal courage and his energy in his missionary activity. Wesley accomplished but little till he learned it. This has also been the basis of the great Evangelical revival, which is represented today not only by the tenets of the Evangelical party, but also by the fundamental teaching of most of the leading Churchmen of our time.

But it is important to remember that when the truth of salvation by faith, apart from works, is taught and received only as a doctrine, it loses its power, and, by reason of necessary changes in the meaning of words that were never intended to appeal only to the intellect, even becomes an untruth. He who would understand the Epistle to the Galatians must be, and must remain, in vital connexion with Christ by faith. Then, but only then, will the Epistle be more than a parchment in an ancient Library, and the Apostle speak to him in a living tongue, a tongue of fire and of love.

CHAPTER VII.

Canonicity and Genuineness.

The Epistle to the Galatians has always had an assured place in the Canon of the New Testament, but in view of recent statements that it was composed in the 2nd century, in common with other Epistles of St Paul, it is necessary to recall early evidence of its use.

Marcion when at Rome (probably in 144 A.D.) seceded from the Christian Church there and became the head of a separate body. Yet both he and the Christian Church accepted Galatians and nine others of St Paul's Epistles, and used them in public worship. It is impossible to suppose that Galatians was taken

over by either side from the other, and it is therefore certain that Galatians was accepted by both parties before Marcion's secession. This would also appear to indicate that it was not composed during Marcion's lifetime, say after 110 A.D.[1] A similar argument may be deduced from the fact that the Valentinians are referred to by Irenaeus (1. 3. 5) as quoting Gal. vi. 14. Further, the existence of small differences in the text of Marcion from that of the Church indicates that some years had elapsed before 110 A.D. since the Epistle was composed.

Further it must be remembered that the great Churches had had an unbroken existence from St Paul's own time, and would know the Epistles that were addressed to them, and there is no evidence that any Church received as genuine a false letter nominally addressed to them. This argument does not apply indeed to a letter addressed to the believers of North Galatia, but it does to 1 and 2 Cor. and Rom., the genuineness of which is denied by those few persons who deny that of Galatians. Neither, it may be added, would these Churches be likely to permit those grave alterations in the text of the Epistles between A.D. 70 and 110 which certain subjective theories require.

Among Church writers Clement of Rome, 'Barnabas' and Ignatius are thought to allude to the Epistle (the passages are given in Lightfoot), and Polycarp (117 A.D.) uses certain phrases which are found there only. These are IX. 2, 'had run in vain' (ii. 2); III. 3, 'which is the mother of us all' (iv. 26); V. 1, 'God is not mocked' (vi. 7).

Justin Martyr, *Dial. w. Trypho*, cc. 95, 96, uses the same argument from Deut. xxvii. 26, xxi. 23 as in Gal. iii. 10, 13, and in his First Apology (c. 53) applies Isa. liv. 1 as St Paul applies it in Gal. iv. 27.

[1] Marcion placed it first in his collection, doubtless because of all St Paul's Epistles it was the most strongly marked with the characteristic teaching of St Paul whom he accepted as the purest exponent of Christianity. It seems to have been placed first also in the old Syriac Version (Zahn, *Commentary*, p. 22).

Irenaeus (*Adv. Haer.* III. 7. 2) quotes the Epistle by name: 'Sed in ea quae est ad Galatas, sic ait, Quid ergo lex factorum? posita est usque quo veniat semen cui promissum est etc.' Gal. iii. 19. See also III. 6. 5, and 16. 3, V. 21. 1.

It is also contained in the Old Latin Version of the 2nd century, and in the Syriac Version, the date of which however is not so certain. It is also mentioned in the Muratorian Canon.

Its canonicity and genuineness have in fact never been denied until quite recent years.

Baur made it his chief test of the genuineness of Epistles bearing St Paul's name, accepting fully both it and Romans with 1 Cor., and, with less certainty, 2 Cor.

Lately, a few critics have denied, on purely subjective grounds, the authorship of this and all other Epistles attributed to St Paul, arguing especially that 'the doctrinal and religious-ethical contents betoken a development in Christian life and thought of such magnitude and depth as Paul could not possibly have reached within a few years after the crucifixion. So large an experience, so great a widening of the field of vision, so high a degree of spiritual power as would have been required for this it is impossible to attribute to him within so limited a time' (Van Manen, *Encycl. Bib.* cc. 3627 sq.).

This argument may have some force, on Van Manen's premisses that Christ was a mere man who died and never rose, but on them only. Pfleiderer, not a critic biassed in favour of orthodox Christianity, writes on the other hand: 'A...theology like the Pauline, which overthrows the Jewish religion by the methods of proof drawn from the Jewish schools, is perfectly intelligible in the case of the historic Paul, who was converted from a pupil of the Pharisees to an apostle of Christ; it would be wholly unintelligible in a "Pauline Christian" of the second century' (*Primitive Christianity*, E. T. 1906, I. 209 sq.).

CHAPTER VIII.

The Text.

The authorities for the Greek text of our Epistle are so nearly the same as those for that of Colossians that it is sufficient to refer the student to the somewhat full statement given in the edition of Colossians and Philemon in *The Cambridge Greek Testament for Schools*.

CHAPTER IX.

A Plan of the Epistle.

(*A*) i. 1—5. *Salutation.*

(*B*) i. 6—9. *Subject of the Epistle stated*, in St Paul's surprise at the rapidity with which the Galatians were listening to a false gospel.

(*C*) i. 10—ii. 21. *St Paul's defence of himself.*

i. 10—12. My one object is to please God, and to serve Christ, who revealed to me the Gospel.

i. 13, 14. The Gospel was no product of my previous life.

i. 15—17. Nor of conference with other Christians after my conversion.

i. 18—24. I paid a very brief visit to Jerusalem, which was followed by a long absence.

ii. 1—10. After fourteen years more I visited Jerusalem again and saw certain Apostles, towards whom I maintained full independence, which indeed they recognized.

ii. 11—14. In particular I acted independently towards Cephas and Barnabas.

ii. 15—21. (*Transition* to *D.*) My attitude and words to Peter were the same as those towards you now—observance of the Law is not necessary for Gentile Christians.

(*D*) iii.—v. 12. *A clear doctrinal statement of salvation by faith, with renewed appeals.*

iii. 1—6. Your very reason, and your own experience, should tell you the all-importance of faith.

iii. 7—9. Faith makes men sons of Abraham, and brings the blessing promised in him.

iii. 10—14. Works regarded as a source of life bring a curse, faith the blessing and the Spirit.

iii. 15—18. The relation of the promise to the Law; the latter cannot hinder the former.

iii. 19—22. The true place and purpose of the Law. It was subordinate to the promise, and preparatory, by developing the sense of sin.

iii. 23—iv. 7. The contrast between our former state of pupillage under the Law, and our present state of deliverance by Christ and of full sonship.

iv. 8—11. Appeal; after so great a change how can you go back!

iv. 12—20. A further appeal; based on his behaviour among them and their treatment of him.

iv. 21—v. 1. Another appeal; based on the principles of bondage and freedom underlying the history of Hagar and Sarah, and the birth of Isaac. Christ set us free; stand fast therefore in this freedom.

v. 2—12. Another, but sharper, appeal and warning. The observance of the Law is inconsistent with faith in Christ.

(*E*) v. 13—vi. 10. *Practical. Liberty is not license, but service. Not the flesh but the spirit must be the aim of the believer.*

v. 13—15. Yet true freedom implies service to others.

v. 16—24. The nature, outcome and means of liberty in daily life.

v. 25—vi. 6. Life by the Spirit brings unselfish care for others, e.g. for one's teachers.

vi. 7—10. Show such kindness, for the harvest will come.

(*F*) vi. 11—16. *Autographic summary of the Epistle (the autograph continuing to v.* 18). *The aims of the false teachers and his own contrasted. The cross as the means of the new creation in believers is all-important.*

(*G*) vi. 17. *Nothing can trouble me; I belong to my master, Jesus.*

(*H*) vi. 18. *Valediction.*

CHAPTER X.

Some Commentaries of which use has been made in the preparation of this Edition.

Those marked with * are quite indispensable to a serious student. The few remarks may afford some guidance.

Jerome, 387 or 388 A.D. Probably he drew largely from Origen's lost commentaries. He always endeavours to show the practical bearing of the Epistle on the theological difficulties of his time.

Chrysostom, *Hom.*, *c.* 390 A.D. Disappointing after his Colossians. Ed. F. F(ield), 1852.

Theodore of Mopsuestia, *c.* 420 A.D. Philosophical. Ed. Swete, 1880.

Theodoret, *c.* 440 A.D. A model of a brief popular commentary. Unfortunately c. ii. 6—14 is missing. Ed. Noesselt, Halle, 1771.

Luther, 1519 A.D. Valuable for the light thrown on Luther's personal relation both to Pharisaism and to antinomianism. English translation, 1644.

Perkins, W. Typically Puritan, bounded by the practical needs of his audience. Cambridge, 1604.

Wetstein, *Nov. Test.* 1752. Invaluable for its parallels from Classical writers, early and late.

*Bengel, *Gnomon*, 1773. Amazing for conciseness, and for insight both intellectual and spiritual. Ed. Steudel, 1862.

Jowett, 1855. Clear and independent.

Alford, 4th ed., 1865. Great common sense.

Ellicott, 4th ed., 1867. Grammar and patristic references.

*Lightfoot, 3rd ed., 1869. For learning, judgment and literary charm still the best commentary in any language.

*Meyer (E. T. 1880). Acute, especially in points of grammar, and valuable for its presentation of various opinions.

Beet, J. A., 2nd ed., 1885. Earlier and longer than his work on Colossians, but not so stimulating.

Findlay, G. G., in the *Expositor's Bible*, 1888. Admirable for the preacher.

Sieffert in Meyer's *Kommentar*, Göttingen, 1899.

*Ramsay, Sir William M. *Hist. Comm.*, 2nd ed., 1900. Extraordinarily brilliant, but containing not a little special pleading in favour of the South Galatian theory.

Weiss, B., *Die Paulinische Briefe*, 2nd ed., 1902. Brief, but never to be neglected.

Rendall, F., in the *Expositor's Greek Testament*, 1903. Invariably interesting and ingenious.

*Zahn, T., 1905. Original and independent, with immense learning. His *Einleitung*, 3rd ed., 1906, English translation, 1909, is invaluable, and has much introductory matter that is not contained in the Commentary.

Bacon, B. W., 1909. Very suggestive. The writer of the Acts idealizes.

Among other books may be mentioned:

Askwith, E. H., *The Epistle to the Galatians*, an Essay on its destination and date, 1899.

Woodhouse, W. J. and Schmiedel, P. W. in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, 1901, coll. 1589—1626.

Steinmann, A., *Die Abfassungszeit des Galaterbriefes.* Münster, 1906.

Steinmann, A., *Der Leserkreis des Galaterbriefes.* Münster, 1908.

Deissmann, A., *Licht vom Osten. Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt*, 1908. English translation, *Light from the Ancient East*, 1910.

Moffatt, J., *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, 3rd ed., 1918.

CHAPTER XI. Chronology of part of the life of St Paul[1].

A.D.		Acts	Galatians
35–36 (34 or 36)	Conversion	Ac. ix.	Gal. i. 15, 16
	Visit to Arabia	... ...	Gal. i. 17
38 (37 or 38) ...	First visit to Jerusalem	Ac. ix. 26	Gal. i. 18
	Visit to Cilicia	Ac. ix. 30	Gal. i. 21
45 (44) ...	Brought from Tarsus by Barnabas to Antioch, where he stays a year	Ac. xi. 25, 26	Gal. i. 21
46 (45) ...	Second visit to Jerusalem with alms	Ac. xi. 29, 30	
47 (48) ...	First visit to S. Galatia (on first Missionary Journey)	Ac. xiii. 14—xiv. 23	
49 (51) ...	St Peter at Antioch	... ...	Gal. ii. 11—14
	Third visit to Jerusalem (Council)	Ac. xv. 4—29	Gal. ii. 1—10
49 (51) ...	Second visit to S. Galatia (on second Missionary Journey, 49 (51)—51 (53))	Ac. xvi. 1—5	
	First visit to N. Galatia	Ac. xvi. 6	Gal. iv. 13—15
50, 51 (52) ...	1 *Thessalonians*		
50, 51 (53) ...	2 *Thessalonians*		
52 (54) ...	Second visit to N. Galatia (on third Missionary Journey, 52 (54)—56 (58))	Ac. xviii. 23	[Gal. iv. 13]
55 (57) ...	1 *Corinthians*, in the Spring, from Ephesus		
55 (57) ...	2 *Corinthians*, in the Autumn, from Macedonia ...		
55–56 (57–58) ...	*Galatians*, in the late Autumn, from Macedonia, or in the Winter, from Corinth		
56 (58) ...	*Romans*, in the Spring, from Corinth		

[1] The dates are based upon the general system framed by Mr C. H. Turner in his article on the Chronology of the New Testament in Hastings' *D. B.* i. 415 sqq. Those assigned by Lightfoot (*Biblical Essays*, 1893, pp. 221 sq., with note in *Gal.* ii. 1, 2) are added in brackets.

THE EPISTLE OF PAUL THE APOSTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

PAUL, an apostle, (not of men, neither by man, but by 1
Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him

CHAPTER I.

1—5. Salutation.

(*v.* 1) Paul appointed Apostle, by no human source or agency, but by Jesus Christ and (with Him) God the Father, who raised Him from the dead (He called me and He lives !), (*v.* 2) and all my present travelling companions—to the various Churches of Galatia !

(*v.* 3) Grace to you and peace (with Him and in your hearts and lives) from God the Father of us Christians and from the Lord Jesus Christ (to whom alone we owe our present state), (*v.* 4) who gave Himself to death on behalf of our sins, that He might release us out of the age of the evil one who besetteth us—both His death and our deliverance being in accordance with the effective will of our God and Father,

(*v.* 5) To whom be the glory rightly due to Him, unto the ages of eternity. Amen.

1. In all the other Epistles of St Paul the salutation ends with our *v.* 3. Here *v.* 4 enlarges on the work of Christ, and *v.* 5 adds a doxology. In Rom. and Tit. a somewhat similar enlargement is made earlier in the salutation.

Paul] His Gentile name, and always used of him in connexion with his Gentile work; from Ac. xiii. 9 onwards in St Luke's narrative (contrast Ac. xxii. 7, 13, xxvi. 14); see also Ramsay, *St Paul the Traveller*, pp. 81—87.

an apostle] Envoys ('envoy' is perhaps the best translation of the Greek word) were frequently sent by Jews from Jerusalem to instruct, and to gather alms. They represented those who sent them. The name therefore was suitably given by Christ to the Twelve (Lk. vi. 13), and as suitably claimed by St Paul. 'The qualifications for the office are (1) a Divine call (Lk. vi. 13; John xv. 16; Ac. i. 2, 24); (2) a personal

2 from the dead;) and all the brethren which are with me,

knowledge of the Lord Jesus, as the *Risen* Saviour (Ac. i. 21, 22; 1 Cor. ix. 1); (3) the inspiration and infallible teaching of the Holy Ghost (John xiv. 26, xvi. 13); (4) a Divine commission (Ac. xxii. 21, xxvi. 16—18).' (E. H. Perowne.) Here only does St Paul at once lay stress on the fact of his apostleship, and proceed to elaborate its meaning. This unique description bears closely upon the purpose and method of the Epistle. Cf. 'called to be an apostle' in Rom. i. 1. Cf. also 1 Cor. ix. 1.

not of men] For a similar contrast of men to Christ cf. Col. ii. 8, 20—22, iii. 23, 24.

Probably he was thinking especially of the Twelve. His apostleship was not from them. Ac. xiii. 1—3 doubtless refers to a special commission; otherwise he might mean that his apostleship was not in reality from the Church of Antioch.

neither by ('through,' R.V.) *man*] Better, 'a man' with R.V. marg. ('ni par aucun homme'), e.g. neither by Barnabas (Ac. ix. 27, xi. 25), nor by James the head in Jerusalem. St Paul at once mentions his independence as regards man, and his sole responsibility to Jesus and God. No one acted as mediary between him and the source of his commission.

but by ('through,' R.V.) *Jesus Christ, and God the Father*] One preposition governs 'Jesus Christ' and 'God the Father,' as is usual in the salutations. See also *v.* 3 ('from') and 1 Tim. vi. 13 ('in the sight of'). To complete his contrast with the preceding clause he should have added 'of.' The omission is probably due to his vivid sense of the unity of the two Persons. Lightfoot says, 'The channel of his authority (διὰ) coincides with its source (ἀπό).' In the other salutations the Father is mentioned first, here Jesus, perhaps because He appeared to St Paul.

God the Father, who raised him from the dead] From a state of death; see Col. ii. 12 note. The fact that Jesus had really risen from the dead would be the first impression made on St Paul by the words he heard at his call (Ac. ix. 4—6); it was also the pledge of the truth of that which he believed and of its ultimate triumph.

2. *and all the brethren which are with me*] Better, 'and the whole of the brethren with me.' Observe that St Paul here employs a different phrase from that in Phil. iv. 22, 'all the saints,' by which he means all the believers in the place whence a letter was written. Here he means his special friends and workers with him at the time. His usual custom was to name some one person (1 Cor. i. 1; 2 Cor. i. 1; Col. i. 1; Phm. 1). On this occasion he may have purposely avoided any name either lest his own position should seem less independent, or lest the one named should be challenged with him. This would be the more likely if he had with him at the time representatives from Galatia (cf. Sosthenes from Corinth, 1 Cor. i. 1). Further, the absence of names in this salutation may be connected with a similar absence of

unto the churches of Galatia: grace *be* to you and peace 3

names at the close of the Epistle, which was due, no doubt, to the fact that the Epistle was a kind of circular letter intended for more than one place; see vi. 18 note.

brethren] 'Brother' as a term signifying religious relationship is of course far from peculiar to Christianity, though its significance was immensely developed by it. 'Brother' was used of members of religious associations and guilds at least as early as the 2nd century B.C. (see Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 1901, pp. 87, 142; see also Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics*, pp. 96 sqq., 630; Moulton and Milligan in *Expositor*, VII. 5, 1908, p. 58). Even in the O. T. we may see the privileges of 'brother' extended to all Israelites, and even to foreigners who claimed the protection of Jehovah (*Gêrîm*); cf. Lev. xix. 17, 18, 34. In the N.T. 'brethren' is used (*a*) of Jews as such, Acts ii. 29, 37, iii. 17 (cf. 2 Mac. i. 1), (*b*) of Christians as such, see (besides in the Epistles) especially John xxi. 23; Acts xi. 1, xv. 23 *b*. Cf. 'the brotherhood,' 1 Pet. ii. 17, v. 9†, and 'love of the brethren,' 1 Pet. i. 22 (where see Hort); cf. 'the lover of the brethren,' i.e. Jeremiah, 2 Mac. xv. 14.

unto the churches] *Ecclesia*, the Greek word for 'church,' is originally 'an assembly called out' not from other men (see Hort, *The Christian Ecclesia*, p. 5), but from their houses or their ordinary occupations. So in a non-religious sense Ac. xix. 32, 39, 41. So of Jewish religious assemblies and the Jewish congregation as a whole (Septuagint often from Deut. onwards, e.g. Deut. xxxi. 30; Mic. ii. 5; Ezra x. 8; see also Ac. vii. 38). Christians used it (*a*) of an assembly gathered for worship (1 Cor. xiv. 28, 34); (*b*) of the body of believers that usually met in one house (Col. iv. 15; Phm. 2); (*c*) or that belonged to one town (1 Cor. i. 2), or district (Ac. ix. 31, and in the plural, 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 19, and our verse); (*d*) of the whole body of believers (Col. i. 18, 24; Matt. xvi. 18, and in the plural, Rev. xxii. 16). The plural in our verse shows that the letter was sent to many places, doubtless because the errors were not solely, or chiefly, in one town (contrast the errors combated in Col.), but spread over many centres. 'For he writes not to one city, but to the whole nation. For the disease had spread everywhere' (Theodoret).

of Galatia] North Galatia. See Introduction.

3. *grace* be *to you*] St Paul here adapts the common epistolary word for 'greeting,' so as to ask for the Galatians more than ordinary greeting and joy, even God's grace. For this whole verse see the notes on Col. i. 2. Robinson (*Ephesians*, pp. 221—226) shows that St Paul's use of the word 'grace' was 'dominated by the thought of the admission of the Gentiles to the privileges which had been peculiar to Israel.' St Paul prays here and in vi. 18 that this free favour, with all it included, might be continued to his readers; he warns them in *v.* 6 and v. 4 that in it alone lay all their hope; and he employs it as a synonym for his commission to preach to the Gentiles (ii. 9). It is only with a slightly

4 from God the Father, and *from* our Lord Jesus Christ, who gave himself for our sins, that he might deliver us from *this*

different connotation, which still lays stress on the undeserved character of the favour shown, that he uses it of his own call to the Gospel (i. 15), and employs it as marking in the strongest possible way the distinctive character of the Gospel itself in contrast to the Law (ii. 21).

and peace] A Jewish formula perhaps derived ultimately from the High Priest's blessing, Num. vi. 26. As used by St Paul after 'grace' it refers chiefly to external peace, God's protection encircling believers.

from God the Father] Read with R.V. marg.: 'from God our Father.' The Father of us who are in Christ.

and from *our Lord Jesus Christ*] Read with R.V. marg.: 'and the Lord Jesus Christ.' The addition of this clause (though found in each of St Paul's Epistles except Col., and also 1 Thess. which also omits 'from God our Father') serves as a starting-point for laying stress on His work of salvation. Deissmann points out that when St Paul wrote his Epistles '"Lord" was a divine predicate intelligible to the whole Eastern world' (*Licht vom Osten*, p. 254; E. T. p. 354).

4. *who gave himself*] In this sense 1 Tim. ii. 6; Tit. ii. 14†; cf. Ac. xix. 31. So Eleazar, who slew the elephant, 'gave himself to deliver his people' (1 Mac. vi. 44). In ii. 20 St Paul writes, 'who...gave himself up for me' (R.V.), where, as here, there may be an echo of our Lord's saying recorded in Mk. x. 45 and Matt. xx. 28. Observe how St Paul loses no time in speaking of Christ's work of deliverance in this Epistle which insists so much upon the completeness of the freedom obtained for us.

for] The Greek word (*hyper*) has the sense of 'interest in.' For the phrase 'for our sins' cf. 1 Cor. xv. 3.

that he might deliver us from] 'out of,' R.V. The Greek word for 'deliver' occurs here only in St Paul's Epistles. With the following preposition it suggests that the persons delivered have been within the grasp of the enemy; see also Col. i. 13, R.V.

this *present evil world*] Better, 'age,' R.V. marg. See notes on Textual Criticism. On this difficult phrase see Bp Chase, *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*, pp. 115—117. Two interpretations are possible:

(1) 'out of the present age, evil as it is.' But the word translated 'present' seems to be 'used in a strictly temporal sense only when the context...defines the meaning' (Rom. viii. 38; 1 Cor. iii. 22); the primary thought is rather 'of imminence, often of some threatening power' (Bp Chase).

(2) A better rendering is: 'out of the age of the evil one who besetteth us,' the age being regarded as the possession of the evil one. So Barnabas xv. 5, 'His son shall come and destroy the time of the lawless one.' Cf. 1 John v. 19 (R.V.). In this case the reference to the Lord's Prayer appears to be certain.

present evil world, according to the will of God and our Father: to whom *be* glory for ever and ever. Amen. 5
I marvel that you are so soon removed from him that 6

according to the will] Probably with both 'gave himself' and 'deliver us,' etc., i.e. both Christ's sacrifice of Himself and the object of that sacrifice were in accordance with God's will.

of God and our Father] 'of our God and Father,' R.V. Supremacy, suggesting power and worship; Fatherhood, as regards believers (*v.* 3 note), suggesting their origin and their protection.

5. *to whom* be *glory* ('the glory,' R.V.) *for ever and ever. Amen*] The doxology in the salutation (here only) takes the place of thanks to God for his readers. The article suggests 'which properly belongs to Him.' 'For ever and ever.' Literally (see R.V. marg.) 'unto the ages of the ages.' Eternity is regarded not merely as a succession of ages, but as a succession of ages each of which embraces many ages.

6—9. Subject of the Epistle stated.

6—9. *Surprise at the rapidity with which they were yielding to the false teachers.*

(*v.* 6) I wonder that you are so quickly (yielding to the temptation and) going over from God who called you in the grace that is to be found in Christ, into a second gospel, (*v.* 7) which gospel is nothing else than an attempt of persons to disturb your allegiance, and a desire on their part to reverse completely the gospel that Christ gave. (*v.* 8) But (so abhorrent is this act to me) supposing that even if I and my fellow-workers, or an angel from heaven, were to preach a gospel to you contrary to that gospel which we did preach to you, let him be accursed and separated from God. (*v.* 9) As I and my fellow-workers have said to you in time past, so now, at this time, I say again, if anyone does preach you a gospel contrary to that which ye once accepted at our hands, let him be accursed and separated from God.

6. *I marvel that you are so soon*] Hardly 'so soon,' referring to the brevity of time (Phil. ii. 19, 24) since his first or his second visit, but 'so quickly' (R.V.), referring to the rapidity with which they are yielding to the temptation: cf. 1 Tim. v. 22; 2 Thess. ii. 2; Wisd. xiv. 28, 'or lightly (lit. quickly) forswear themselves.' So also Ex. xxxii. 8, 'they turned aside quickly,' where the Hebrew leaves no room for doubt. See Introduction, p. xxxvi.

removed] 'removing,' R.V. Here only in the Pauline Epistles. So 2 Mac. vii. 24, where Antiochus promised to enrich the youngest son of the seven brethren, if he would 'turn' from the customs of his fathers. The present shows that St Paul still hoped that the change would not be completed. Cf. his frequent use of the present in this Epistle, e.g. iii. 3, iv. 9. Ecclus. vi. 9, 'and there is a friend that turneth to enmity,' often quoted, illustrates the moral use of the verb

called you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel:
7 which is not another; but there be some that trouble you,

(cf. 'the turncoat' of Dionysius who left Stoicism for Epicureanism), but not the use of the present, for there it is timeless, as the Hebrew shows.

from him that called you] Almost certainly God the Father (*v.* 5). The words also probably suggest, as Chrysostom says, that the Galatians thought they were pleasing the Father by observing the Law, as the Jews thought when they persecuted Jesus. The call (v. 8, 13) is so often attributed to the Father (*v.* 15) that the clause can hardly mean 'from Christ who called you' (Peshito).

into ('in,' R.V.) *the grace of Christ*] The textual evidence for 'Christ' is overwhelming. 'In' suggests the permanence of the Divine favour in which God calls (cf. ii. 21; also 2 Thess. ii. 16; Heb. xii. 15), and through which and in which the blessing of Christ is given (Ac. xv. 11; Rom. v. 15).

unto another gospel] 'unto a different gospel,' R.V. The English word 'gospel' is the modern form of the Anglo-Saxon 'godspell,' which either = 'God (i.e. Christ) story,' as may be seen in King Alfred's translation of 2 Cor. iv. 4, 'onlihtnes [illuminatio] Cristes godspelles,' or 'good spell,' a translation of *evangelion*. This Greek word meant originally the reward for good tidings, and afterwards the good tidings itself, as always in the New Testament. Its use to designate the 'book' in which Christ's teaching is recorded, as distinguished from that teaching in itself, is ecclesiastical. The plural 'gospels,' with direct reference to our four canonical Gospels, is first found in Justin Martyr (see Milligan, *Thess.* pp. 141 sqq.).

7. *which is not another*] 'which is not another *gospel*,' R.V. The relation between the two words translated 'different' (R.V.) and 'another' is uncertain.

(1) Possibly 'different' refers to difference in kind, 'another' to difference in number: 'to a different gospel, which is not in reality a second gospel,' for it is no gospel at all. Cf. Geneva, 'seeing there is no nother,' and Osterwald, 'non qu'il y ait un autre *évangile*.' So apparently in 2 Cor. xi. 4, 'another,' i.e. a second, 'Jesus,' but 'a different spirit,' and 'a different gospel' (R.V.). In this case the semicolon after 'another' stands.

(2) But probably the word translated 'different'=a second in a series, indicating the slighter specific difference between members of the same class (*v.* 19, vi. 4); 'another' the broader generic difference between two distinct classes, a second regarded as belonging to another series (v. 10). Thus in Thuc. II. 40. 1—3 the former 'indicates another class of the Athenians (viz. the industrial as distinguished from the military or the statesman class), while the latter denotes other nations as distinguished from the Athenians' (Ramsay, *Gal.* p. 263, whom consult for other passages, and the opinions of other scholars). In this case the semicolon after 'another' must be omitted.

and would pervert the gospel of Christ. But though we, or 8
an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you

which is not another; but] 'only,' R.V. Better, 'save that.' Two interpretations are now possible :

(1) Perhaps 'unto another gospel (I mean that promulgated by the older Apostles) which is not a different gospel (from mine, for they really agree with me), except in so far as there are some that...would pervert' etc. But this seems to read too much into the sentence.

(2) More probably 'unto a different gospel ; which is nothing else save that there are some that...would pervert' etc. (so American Revisers' marg., Ramsay, Tyndale, Great Bible. They are proclaiming another gospel which pretends to be more, but really they are only troubling you and wishing to overthrow the true.

there be some] 'are,' R.V., modernizing the English. St Paul here gives his opinion of their action, in (*a*) its primary effect, the disturbance of the proper attitude of the Galatian Christians, and (*b*) its purpose.

that trouble you] Continuing the metaphor of 'removing,' *v.* 6, i.e. raising seditions among you ; cf. v. 10. So even Ecclus. xxviii. 9, 'a man that is a sinner will trouble friends.' In Ac. xv. 24 the Church at Jerusalem employs the same term with reference to the same controversy.

and would (i.e. desire to) *pervert*] The Greek word occurs elsewhere in the N.T. Ac. ii. 20 ; Jas. iv. 9 W.H. marg. †, in each case of complete change into something of the opposite nature. So also here. Cf. Ecclus. xi. 31, 'He lieth in wait to turn things that are good into evil.'

the gospel of Christ] In itself the genitive may be subjective, the gospel preached and sent by Christ (so doubtless 'the word of Christ,' Col. iii. 16) ; or objective, the gospel of Christ's coming and work, as probably in 1 Thess. iii. 2. But St Paul's claim to preach the gospel that he had received from Christ Himself, *v.* 12, and his insistence upon its all-importance, suggest the former interpretation here.

8. *But though we*] I and those with me (*v.* 2) in spite of any such false statements as the Galatians may have heard (*v.* 10 note). They know the gospel that he preached on his first visit. He will afterwards remind them of the effect of it among them, briefly in *v.* 9 and more in detail in iii. 1 sqq. Upholders of the South Galatian theory see an implied reference to St Paul's circumcision of Timothy, a semi-Gentile, which might have suggested his sympathy with obedience to the Law on the part of Gentile Christians on his second visit (Ac. xvi. 3).

or an angel from heaven] 'From heaven' is added probably only to enhance the dignity of the supposed preacher. Upholders of the South Galatian theory compare the belief at Lystra in a Divine visit, and the assertion that St Paul was Hermes the messenger of the gods (cf. iv. 14 note and Introd. p. xxx.).

preach any other gospel unto you than that *which we have preached unto you*] 'should preach unto you any gospel other than that which

than *that* which we have preached unto you, let him be
9 accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any
man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have

we preached unto you,' R.V. 'Other than,' one word in the Greek, meaning 'contrary to' (Rom. xvi. 17), and so R.V. marg. After so strong a word as 'pervert' 'besides' seems improbable. But Protestant commentators have not unnaturally deduced from 'other than' a lesson against the addition of anything besides the Scriptures: 'For he that delivers any doctrine out of them, and beside them, as necessary to be believed, is accursed' (Perkins). 'We preached.' The reference is to St Paul's companions on his first visit (Silas and Timothy, Ac. xv. 40, xvi. 3), or on his second (probably Timothy). According to the South Galatian theory they would be Barnabas on the first visit (Ac. xiii., xiv.) and Silas and Timothy on the second.

let him be accursed] 'anathema,' R.V. = *v.* 9. The Greek word 'anathema' is in the LXX. the regular translation of the Hebrew *cherem*, a thing devoted to God either for preservation or destruction. In Rabbinic and modern times *cherem* often signifies excommunication from a visible society, and this meaning has been attributed to 'anathema' here. But to the Apostle 'anathema' is the very antithesis of nearness and likeness to Christ. Hence he names as the supreme example of demonic utterance the saying 'Jesus is anathema' (R.V. 1 Cor. xii. 3) and suggests as the most extreme form of his love to the Israelites that he could pray to be himself 'anathema from Christ' (R.V. Rom. ix. 3). Here therefore he is solemnly writing a curse in the strongest possible form, 'alienated from God' (Theodore on Zech. xiv. 8, quoted by Swete). Deissmann sees in this passage and others (especially 1 Cor. v. 4, 5) examples of the influence upon St Paul of the heathen use of formulae devoting persons to gods of the underworld (*Licht vom Osten*, pp. 218 sqq.; E. T. pp. 303 sqq.).

9. Repeats the curse, but (*a*) the change from the subjunctive to the indicative suggests that there is a person actually engaged in this erroneous preaching; (*b*) St Paul lays stress on the fact that the gospel of this person contradicts what they had in fact accepted.

As we said before, 'as we have said before,' R.V. (cf. v. 2, 3, 21), *so say I now again*] 'Now,' *v.* 10. The statement appears to be too emphatic to refer to *v.* 8. It would seem therefore that even on his last visit (hardly on his first) he felt the need of warning them against possible false teaching. Probably however it had not actually come to them then, or he would hardly have expressed surprise at their beginning to fall away (*v.* 6). Compare iv. 16 note and the Introd. pp. xxxix. sq.

that ye have received] 'that which ye received,' R.V. The Greek word implies 'received at our hands.' He says this 'lest the Galatians should say: We, O Paul, do not pervert the Gospel that thou hast preached unto us: we understood thee not rightly, but the teachers that came after thee have declared unto us the true meaning thereof' (Luther).

received, let him be accursed. For do I now persuade men, 10
or God? or do I seek to please men? for if I yet pleased
men, I should not be the servant of Christ.

10—ii. 21. St Paul's defence of himself.

10—12. *My one object is to please God, and to serve Christ, who revealed to me the Gospel.*

(*v.* 10) I say 'now,' for my words show clearly that I care not to win over men, but God alone. I once indeed tried to please men, but that was before my conversion. If that were still my practice I should not be Christ's servant—His by right and my full consent. (*v.* 11) I say that a change came over me; for I will tell you, my brothers, of the gospel that I brought to you and how I came to preach it. It is not of human measure. (*v.* 12) For indeed it came not to me from man at all, neither did human lips explain it to me, but it came entirely by revelation given me by Christ Himself.

10. *For do I now*] The 'now' is not in contrast to the time before his conversion (see 'yet' *infra*), nor to the occasion when he circumcised Timothy, but only takes up the 'now' of *v.* 9, emphasizing that sentence. The 'for' presents a proof that his strong asseveration there shows that he is not the smooth-tongued hypocrite that his adversaries would make him out to be.

persuade men] 'Am I now winning over men?' (Ac. xii. 20; 2 Mac. iv. 45), i.e. am I softening down unwelcome truths to men, that I may by some means win them over to my way of thinking?

or God?] Possibly 'persuade' retains its full force: 'or am I trying to persuade God, as though I would get Him to tone His message down?' But this attitude towards God seems to have no parallel in St Paul's writings. Doubtless the clause is appended by zeugma, and means 'Or am I not in reality concerned with God only?' For *vv.* 10—12 imply St Paul's absolute dependence on God in contrast to men.

or do I seek to please men] Cf. 'men-pleasers' in Col. iii. 22, and perhaps 1 Thess. ii. 4, where however see Milligan. Probably both this and the preceding sentence refer to accusations, brought against St Paul by the Judaizers, that he accommodated the gospel to the heathen, allowing them not to observe the Jewish Law, although its observance was necessary, in order that he might persuade them to a kind of belief in Christ.

if I yet pleased men] 'if I were still pleasing men,' R.V.; cf. v. 11. He refers to the time before his conversion when he showed complaisance to Jews in persecuting Christians.

I should not be the servant of Christ] 'I should not be Christ's slave.' The emphatic position of Christ suggests that he would be the slave of another (Rom. vi. 22). Probably St Paul already has in his mind the liberty he has obtained by being the slave of a Divine master; see iv. 5, v. 1 notes.

11 But I certify you, brethren, that the gospel which was
12 preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of man, neither was I taught *it*, but by the revelation of

11. *But I certify you*] 'For I make known to you,' R.V. The 'but' of the Received Text and W.H. margin is perhaps taken from 1 Cor. xv. 1. *For.* I have suggested that a great change came over me; I say so for I will now tell you more fully of it and the nature of the Gospel entrusted then to me. The direct personal statement 'I (we) make known to you' is found only in the nearly contemporary letters 1 Cor. xii. 3, xv. 1; 2 Cor. viii. 1, in each case introducing matter of grave importance.

brethren] St Paul uses this appeal no less than nine times in this Epistle. Its absence from 'Eph.' Col. suggests that, besides meaning 'brethren in Christ,' it had also the connotation of personal and individual acquaintance. Its frequency in Rom. is more an apparent than a real exception, in view of the number of his friends at Rome (c. xvi.). It is also not found in the Pastoral Epistles, for Timothy and Titus were rather his sons.

that the gospel which was preached of me] Cf. ii. 2. The gospel for the preaching of which among them he himself had been responsible. For the form of the sentence cf. 1 Thess. ii. 1. He appears to mean not the historical facts (1 Cor. xv. 1), but the Gospel as it essentially is, including (but not confined to) the freedom of Gentile converts from the Law.

is not after man] Not after the standard and measure of man. The phrase is stronger than 'after the tradition of men,' Col. ii. 8, and even than 'the doctrines of men,' Col. ii. 22. It is above man's devising, to be received and handed on in its integrity, neither diminished nor increased. Compare iii. 15 note.

12. *For I neither, etc.*] Expanding the thought of 'after man.' My Gospel is not after the measure of man, for indeed it came to me not through man at all but through the personal revelation of Jesus Christ. 'Neither' apparently does not emphasize the 'I,' as though he was claiming equality with the Twelve, but refers to the whole clause.

received it of man] 'at the hands of man' or perhaps 'a man' as in R.V. marg. Contrast 1 Thess. ii. 13, iv. 1; 2 Thess. iii. 6.

neither was I taught it] Though received from God it might have been explained by man. This was not the case.

but by the revelation of Jesus Christ] 'But it came to me through revelation from Jesus Christ'; as his apostleship (*v.* 1) so his reception of the Gospel. He is doubtless thinking only of the time of his conversion, not of his later experiences recorded in 2 Cor. xii. 1—7. 'Revelation' (ii. 2; cf. verb *v.* 16, iii. 23) always of the unveiling of Divine things (which therefore are presumably not far off), never of one man revealing a secret to another. 'Revelation is distinguished from ordinary moral and spiritual influences by its suddenness. It shows us in an instant, what under ordinary circumstances would grow

Jesus Christ. For ye have heard of my conversation in 13
time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I
persecuted the church of God, and wasted it: and profited 14

up gradually and insensibly. In the individual it is accompanied by a sudden transition from darkness to light; in the world at large it is an anticipation of moral truth and of the course of human experience' (Jowett).

'Jesus Christ' is doubtless subjective, as even in Rev. i. 1. Observe that the words form a claim parallel to the affirmation by our Lord about St Peter (Mt. xvi. 17). Perhaps not unintentionally, if, as is probable, St Paul knew of our Lord's saying.

13, 14. *The Gospel was no product of my previous life.*

(*v.* 13) For you heard (when I first came among you) of my mode of life once in the religion of the Jews, that I used to persecute excessively the true Church of God, and used to lay it waste, (*v.* 14) and was making progress in the religion of the Jews beyond many of my contemporaries among the Jews, being all the time exceedingly zealous for the traditional teaching handed down to me by my fathers.

13. *For ye have heard of*] 'as we might say: For you, who know my former life, may well believe that it was by nothing short of a miracle I was converted. I will tell you the whole tale, and you will see how unlikely I was to have received the Gospel from the word of others' (Jowett).

'Ye heard,' hardly from Jews, astonished at my conversion; but probably from me and those with me when I preached to you first (*v.* 8).

my conversation] 'my manner of life,' R.V. The Greek word presents nearly the same metaphor as 'walk' but is never hallowed to mean the religious life as such. It is 'the going up and down among men in the various intercourse of life' (Hort on 1 Pet. i. 15); our 'mode of life,' 'converse'; not 'behaviour,' which has only an external connotation. Polybius (IV. 82. 1) has a suggestive parallel to our passage: Philip spent the rest of the winter there, being an object of admiration for his manner of life generally, and his actions that were beyond those of his age. See reff. to the Inscriptions in Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, pp. 88, 194; *Licht vom Osten*, p. 226; E. T. p. 315).

in the Jews' religion] *v.* 14; 2 Mac. ii. 21, viii. 1, xiv. 38 *bis*; 4 Mac. iv. 26‡. Judaism as a religion of faith and custom. Cf. ii. 14; Tit. i. 14. For the contrast between 'Judaism' and 'Christianity' see also Ignat. *ad Magn.* §§ 8, 10.

beyond measure] Peculiar to the 3rd group of St Paul's Epp.

I persecuted] The three verbs, 'persecuted,' 'wasted,' 'profited,' are all in the imperfect tense in the Greek, descriptive of the long continuance of his 'mode of life.'

the church of God] Cf. *v.* 2 note. The exact phrase occurs elsewhere in the N.T. only in 1 Cor. i. 2 (=2 Cor. i. 1), x. 32, xi. 22, xv. 9, and in St Paul's speech, Ac. xx. 28. Compare also 1 Tim. iii. 5, 15, and the plural 1 Cor. xi. 16, 22; 1 Thess. ii. 14; 2 Thess. i. 4.

in the Jews' religion above many *my* [1]equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of

[1] Gr. *equals in years.*

Observe the tacit assumption that the Jews do not form 'the church of God' (contrast the use of the church in Ac. vii. 38), although in 1 Thess. ii. 14 his addition of 'in Christ Jesus' implies that there might be churches of God not in Christ.

and wasted† *it*] 'and made havoc of it,' R.V.; *v.* 23; Ac. ix. 21. Cf. 4 Mac. iv. 23 of Antiochus Epiphanes, 'as he made havoc of them, he made a decree that if any of them should be found out living according to the law of their fathers, they should be put to death.'

14. *and profited*] 'and I advanced,' R.V. The substantive of this verb is translated 'progress' (R.V.) in Phil. i. 12, 25. Contrast the word 'hinder' in v. 7. So on a papyrus of the 2nd cent. A.D. a young soldier thinking of his promotion writes, 'I hope to make rapid progress' (Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 118; E. T. pp. 168 sq.); and on an inscription of the 1st cent. A.D. it is said of a person that he 'advanced to personal acquaintance with the Augusti (Augustus and Tiberius),' *ibid.* p. 277; E. T. p. 383.

above many] With some modesty. Doubtless he could have said all.

my *equals*] 'of mine own age,' R.V. Cf. the quotation from Polybius *v.* 13 and Dan. i. 10.

being more exceedingly zealous] The verb of the word 'zealous' occurs again iv. 17 *bis*, 18. So he describes himself as 'being zealous for God, even as ye all are this day' in Ac. xxii. 3. Cf. also Phil. iii. 6. The same word is used of the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem, Ac. xxi. 20. It would imply that he belonged to the party of the Pharisees but not more than this. On the other hand 'Simon which was called the Zealot,' R.V., Luke vi. 15, 'Simon the zealot,' R.V., Ac. i. 13, doubtless belonged once to the extreme wing of that party which both before and after this time worked so much mischief politically. For its meaning here cf. Mattathias' words in Josephus, *Ant.* XII. 6. 2 (§ 271), 'If any one is zealous for the laws of his fathers, and for the worship of God, let him follow me.' 'Being,' i.e. from the very first and all the time, ii. 14; Ac. xvi. 20, 37.

of ('for,' R.V.) *the traditions of my fathers*†] 'Tradition,' when referring to Jewish teaching, is used so specifically of the Oral in contrast to the Written Law (Mark vii. 3—13; Josephus, *Ant.* XIII. 10. 6 (§ 297), 16. 2 (§ 408)), that there can be little doubt that St Paul uses it so here. His phrase is thus a summary statement of the great principle of the Oral Law, the existence and importance of traditions explanatory of the Written Law and supplementary to it, systematically handed down. By the addition of 'my' St Paul seems to indicate that he uses 'fathers' in its stricter sense (Gen. l. 8; Lev. xxii. 13; Ecclus. xlii. 10; 4 Mac. xviii. 7) of his own relations, not in the wider sense of ancestors of all Jews; contrast Ac. xxii. 3, xxiv. 14, xxviii. 17 and Ecclus. Prol. He doubtless mentions his own ancestors as being in

my fathers. But when it pleased God, who separated me 15
from my mother's womb, and called *me* by his grace, to 16

the chain of tradition, which began (technically speaking) with Moses, because they were not only of purest Hebrew blood, but also Pharisees (Phil. iii. 5; Ac. xxiii. 6). In Ac. xxii. 3, 'the law of our fathers' seems to refer primarily to the Written Law. See also Col. ii. 8.

15—17. *Nor was the Gospel a product of conference with other Christians.*

(*v.* 15) But when (in contrast to the life described in *vv.* 13, 14) God, who separated me in purpose before I was even born (there is the true Phariseeship!), and called me by His grace (at my conversion), (*v.* 16) was pleased to reveal His Son in my heart, in order that I may ever preach Him as the Gospel among the Gentiles—at once I did not lay the matter before any mere man for his approval and advice, (*v.* 17) nor did I even go up to Jerusalem to those who were senior to me in apostleship, but, on the contrary, I went away to the solitudes of Arabia, and after staying there a time returned again to Damascus (where, as you know, my conversion had taken place).

15. *But when it pleased God...immediately I conferred not*] For St Paul's present aim is not to describe God's revelation to him but his independence of man. 'But.' In contrast to tradition. He received the Gospel by God's good pleasure and call and revelation.

it pleased God] 'it was the good pleasure of God,' R.V. So 1 Cor. i. 21, x. 5, and probably Col. i. 19.

who separated me] Cf. ii. 12. St Paul uses the same term of himself in Rom. i. 1. In Ac. xiii. 2 it is also used of him and Barnabas, but with distinct reference to his first missionary journey. The separation is from others of his nation; cf. Num. viii. 14, xvi. 9, of the sons of Levi, and Lev. xx. 26 of Israel as a whole from other nations. As 'Pharisee'='separated,' it is possible that St Paul consciously contrasted the Phariseeship of his family and training with that of grace, which God had in view for him from the very first. Mr Hart in the illuminating study of Pharisaism contained in his *Ecclesiasticus* (1909, p. 275), points out that as the root *P-R-SH* represents in the Targum of Onkelos the Hebrew *B-D-L* 'separate,' the name Pharisee 'is directly associated with the action of God Himself, who separated light from darkness (Gen. i. 4), Israel from the nations (Lev. xx. 24), and the Levites from the People (Num. xvi. 9).' To an English reader, it may be added, this may seem fanciful, but not to a Jew.

from my mother's womb] Probably='even before my birth,' i.e. before I had any impulses of my own; cf. Isa. xlix. 1; Jer. i. 5. In Luke i. 15 the phrase apparently means from birth onwards.

and called me] When? For 'the "calling" is never an act in the divine mind, but always an historical fact' (Meyer). Perhaps before birth (Isa. xlix. 1), but more probably at his conversion, the call including the whole summons of which the revelation (to be mentioned immediately) was the culminating point.

reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the heathen; immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood:

by ('through,' R.V.) *his grace*] Contrast *v.* 6. The grace of God as such, not a specific form of it as in ii. 9; Rom. xii. 3.

16. *to reveal his Son in me*] Dependent on 'was pleased.' More than external manifestation was necessary. For that alone could not bring truth home to St Paul. He says therefore that the revelation came into his heart and remained there. 'The revelation kept illuminating his soul, and he had the Messiah speaking within him' (Chrys.). This does not of course exclude an external manifestation. Other explanations of 'in me' are (*a*) 'in my case,' cf. *v.* 24, and (*b*) 'in and through me to others.' So perhaps 1 Tim. i. 16. This last explanation (Lightfoot's) is attractive, because we thus obtain a clear distinction of three stages expressed in *vv.* 15, 16, viz.: separation from before birth, call at his conversion, and entering on his ministry to others (Ac. ix. 20 sqq., xiii. 2, 3). But there does not appear to be sufficient reason for distinguishing the 'revelation' of this verse from that of *v.* 12.

that I might preach him among the heathen] 'Gentiles,' R.V.; 'preach,' lit. preach as good news. The Greek is the word 'evangelize.' The final object of God's revelation to him was not his own salvation, but that he should preach to others (Ac. ix. 15). The verb is the present tense suggesting continued effort. For the accusative of the Person preached see Ac. v. 42, viii. 35, xi. 20, xvii. 18†. Contrast *v.* 9.

immediately] This is the only place where the root of this word occurs in St Paul's writings. '"Immediately" is really connected with "went" (*v.* 17); but the Apostle, whose thoughts outrun his words, has interposed the negative clause, to anticipate his purpose in going away' (Jowett). The word does not exclude his first brief ministry in Damascus (Ac. ix. 20), a matter with which he is not concerned. He is showing that he went, not to Jerusalem, but to Arabia.

I conferred‡ not] ii. 6, 'I did not lay (the matter) before.' Cf. ii. 2. The Greek compound verb is sometimes used (as here) of laying a matter before another for his judgment and advice. Zahn quotes Chrysippus: 'For he says that a certain man when he saw a dream... laid it before an interpreter of dreams.'

with flesh and blood] A very common phrase in Rabbinic writings, but always with a slight notion of contemptuous comparison with God. 'Men; whose intelligence is limited and their counsel moulded by the constitution of their material clothing' (Beet). St Paul speaks quite generally, but he would have in his mind any Christians in some position of authority, especially if this was based on past personal intercourse with the incarnate Christ (before or after the Crucifixion; cf. 1 Cor. ix. 1), and, above all, those whom he proceeds to mention in the next clause.

neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were apostles 17
before me: but I went into Arabia, and returned again unto
Damascus. Then after three years I [1]went up to Jerusalem 18

[1] Or, *returned.* Gk. as ver. 17.

17. *neither*] 'nor even.' For if I did not choose to consult others it might have seemed reasonable that I should confer with the Twelve.

went I up] *v.* 18; John vi. 3. So also ii. 1, 2 and often in Gospels and Acts. 'up,' see ii. 1 note.

to them which were apostles before me] The priority of their apostleship formed the only reason why it was likely that he should go.

but I went] 'away,' R.V. In the Pauline Epp. Rom. xv. 28†. I went quite away from Jerusalem and any other place where I was likely to meet with Christians. Not, of course, in order that he might preach to the heathen (in spite of the mention of this in *v.* 16) but that he might be alone. This would not exclude some evangelistic activity if the opportunity presented itself, but it cannot have been the primary object of his withdrawing from Christian counsellors.

into Arabia] Perhaps he wandered through various parts of the large kingdom of the Nabathaeans, extending at that time from Damascus to the Sinaitic peninsula. It is hardly probable that he went to Mt Sinai itself. See Appendix, Note A.

and returned again unto Damascus] Why does he mention this fact? Because as he did go there it was the simplest way of calling attention to the fact that he did not go to Jerusalem even now. Observe that he has not stated that his conversion was near Damascus; the 'again,' which is emphatic in the Greek (cf. R.V.), is an undesigned coincidence with Ac. ix. 3.

18—24. *A short visit to Jerusalem and then a long absence. Yet the churches of Judaea, though they knew me not by sight, recognized me and my work.*

(*v.* 18) Then three years from my conversion I did go up to Jerusalem to gratify my curiosity to see Cephas, and I stayed with him only a fortnight. (*v.* 19) But I saw no other of the Apostles, with the exception of one who is not quite in the same class, James the brother of the Lord. (*v.* 20) God is my witness to the truth of my statements. (*v.* 21) Then I went far away into the country districts of Syria and of Cilicia. (*v.* 22) But I was entirely unknown by sight to the Christian churches of Judaea. (*v.* 23) Only they were hearing: Our former persecutor is now preaching the glad tidings of the faith of which once he used to make havoc. (*v.* 24) And they found occasion in me to glorify God.

18. *Then*] 'The twice-repeated "then" in this verse, in *v.* 21 and in ii. 1, singles out three events in the Apostle's life bearing upon his intercourse with the Church of Jerusalem: his first introduction to them, his departure to a distant sphere of labour, and his return to Jerusalem with Barnabas' (Rendall). In itself 'then' may mark either a fresh

19 to see Peter, and abode with him fifteen days. But other of the apostles saw I none, save James the Lord's brother.

stage in the enumeration (1 Cor. xii. 28; Heb. vii. 2), or a point of time consecutive to what has preceded (1 Cor. xv. 23, 46; Heb. vii. 27). Often of course the two coalesce, as is expressly brought out by 'after this' in John xi. 7 and in our verse by the following words. See also ii. 1 note.

after three years] From his conversion. For this is the only important time that he has as yet mentioned. He was emphasizing the fact that so long a period elapsed between that and his visit to Jerusalem. He contrasts the end of the three years with their beginning, 'neither went I up' (*v.* 17).

I went up] See the note on the same phrase in ii. 1. The visit is that recorded in Ac. ix. 26.

to see†] 'to visit,' R.V., 'to become acquainted with,' R.V. marg. The Greek word occurs in the Bible only in 1 Esdr. i. 31 (33) *bis*, 40 (42) in the meaning of 'relate.' Here it='see,' differing from the common word for this 'only as it has for its object any remarkable person or thing. Thus it means *to visit the curiosities of a place*. Josephus (*Ant.* I. 11. 4 [§ 203]), speaking of Lot's wife, says: "she was changed into a pillar of salt. And I visited it, for it remains to this day"' (adapted from Field, *Notes on the translation of the N.T.*). Cf. also Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, VII. 7, p. 474, 1909. Chrysostom writes: 'He did not say "see" Peter but "visit" Peter, as they say who examine great and magnificent cities. So he considered it worth taking pains even only to see the man.' 'Petrum zu schauen' (Luther). The word, that is to say, suggests that St Paul's visit to Jerusalem was prompted more by curiosity to see St Peter than by any other motive. Jülicher (*Paulus und Jesus*, p. 55) thinks that he went in order to learn the facts of our Lord's life on earth. But this is to forget the abundant evidence that at least the main facts of that life were circulated orally among all believers almost or quite from the very first.

Peter] 'Cephas,' R.V., as in ii. 9, 11, 14; elsewhere only in John i. 42; 1 Cor. i. 12, iii. 22, ix. 5, xv. 5. Contrast 'Peter' in ii. 7, 8 (Paul†). The Aramaic term is generally employed in this Epistle and 1 Cor. because it was more often on the lips of the Jewish-Christian emissaries, and therefore St Paul reverts to it after mentioning the form that was in general use among Greek-speaking Christians.

and abode with him] 'and tarried with him,' R.V., Rheims. 'I prolonged my stay with him,' Ac. x. 48.

fifteen days] Not long enough for me to become his disciple.

19. *But other*] i.e. a second (*v.* 6 note).

of the apostles (*v.* 1 note) *saw I none, save James the Lord's brother*] St Peter was to St Paul the object of attraction, not St James, from whom the emissaries of ii. 12 came, and St Paul saw no other of the Apostles—save etc. The phrase suggests that St Paul put St James

Now *the things* which I write unto you, behold, before God, 20
I lie not. Afterwards I came into the regions of Syria and 21

in a different category from the series of Apostles to which St Peter belonged, though it does not exclude his possession of the title 'Apostle' in some sense ('but only,' R.V. marg., see also Luke iv. 26). See Hort, *Epistle of St James*, p. xix.

By 'the brother' we are probably to understand half-brother, a son of Joseph by a former wife. This (the 'Epiphanian' theory) is defended by Lightfoot in his classical essay contained in his commentary on our Epistle. For a learned defence of the theory that 'brother' means full-brother, a younger son of Joseph and Mary (the 'Helvidian' theory), see J. B. Mayor's edition of the Epistle of St James, pp. v.—xxxvi. See also the discussion in the *Expositor*, VII. 6 and 7. A third theory is that he was a cousin (the 'Hieronymian' theory).

20. *Now* the things *which I write unto you, etc.*] 'It is a matter of life and death to the Apostle to prove his independence of the twelve' (Jowett). St Paul's asseveration refers primarily to what he has already stated about his true relation to them, but naturally its force is carried on to his following words also.

before God] 1 Tim. vi. 13; 2 Tim. ii. 14, iv. 1. Cf. Rom. i. 9.

I lie not] Rom. ix. 1; 2 Cor. xi. 31; 1 Tim. ii. 7.

21. *Afterwards*] 'Then,' R.V.; *v.* 18 note. *vv.* 21—24 continue the description of his independence of the Twelve. He stayed in Jerusalem only a fortnight and then went far away, and that for a long time.

An endeavour has been made to press these verses against the South Galatian theory, by saying that if the letter was addressed to South Galatia, St Paul must have mentioned his first visit, Ac. xiii., xiv., for it would be the strongest proof that he was away from Jerusalem. But if his first visit to South Galatia was long after this decisive journey to Syria and Cilicia there was no need to mention it, and in any case he is not drawing an itinerary. It had nothing to do with his relation to Jerusalem.

I came into the regions] The Greek word originally meant 'slopes.' In Aquila (Lev. xix. 27) apparently of the 'side,' 'edge' of the head, and so perhaps in Jer. xlviii. 45 (=Num. xxiv. 17, Symmachus) of Moab depicted under the figure of a man, though this latter passage may also mean the 'slopes' or 'corner districts' of the land of Moab. Elsewhere in the N.T. (Rom. xv. 23; 2 Cor. xi. 10†) 'districts,' as probably here (cf. Polyb. v. 44. 6, x. 1. 3), not meaning the whole regions of Syria and of Cilicia, but districts in them. Thus the phrase indicates that St Paul did not stay only in Antioch or in Tarsus (Ac. ix. 30, xi. 25).

of Syria and Cilicia] In the Greek an article precedes 'Syria' and in some manuscripts precedes 'Cilicia' also. The omission of the second would imply that Cilicia was part of the same Province as Syria.

There is the same doubt about the text in Ac. xv. 41 (cf. 23). Ramsay (*Gal.* p. 277) says, 'Paul here thinks and speaks of the Roman

22 Cilicia; and was unknown by face unto the churches of
23 Judea which were in Christ: but they had heard only, That
he which persecuted us in times past now preacheth the

Province, which consisted of two great divisions, Syria and Cilicia; and he designates it by the double name, like *Provincia Bithynia et Pontus*. We must accordingly' omit the second article. But, apart from the difficulty of accepting this naïve idea of textual criticism, the expression *Provincia Syria et Cilicia* has never been discovered. Perhaps when St Paul was writing, though hardly when he made his journey, they were separate Provinces, for although 'Cilicia was usually under the legatus of Syria (Dio Cass. 53. 12 where Coele-Syria, Phoenicia, Cilicia, Cyprus are in Caesar's portion; cf. Tac. *Ann.* 2. 78), Cilicia is found under a separate governor in 57 A.D. (Tac. *Ann.* 13. 33) perhaps as a temporary measure after the disturbances of 52 A.D. (*Ann.* 12. 55)' (Woodhouse in *Enc. Bib.* col. 828). In Mr J. G. C. Anderson's map (1903) marking the boundaries of the Provinces from A.D. 63 to A.D. 72 it is separated from Syria. If we are to assume that the mention of these two places corresponds with the formal visits recorded in Ac. ix. 30 (Tarsus), xi. 25 (Syria), then of course the order here given is not chronological, and is due either to the greater political and commercial importance of Syria or to the closer geographical relation of Syria to Jerusalem (='I went to Syria (Ac. xi. 25), nay as far as Cilicia' (Ac. ix. 30). But the above assumption is arbitrary, and it may well be that St Paul is simply describing his course to his home in Tarsus, 'I went away from Jerusalem through Syria to Cilicia.' See also Introd. p. xxii.

22. *and* ('I,' R.V.) *was* ('still,' R.V.) *unknown...but they had heard only*] 'but they only heard say,' R.V. As this is an original Greek part of the N.T., not a translation from Hebrew or Aramaic, Dr Moulton is inclined to give to the periphrastic tense employed here its full classical emphasis, 'I was *entirely* unknown...only they had been *hearing*' (*Proleg.* 1906, p. 227).

by face] Cf. Col. ii. 1; 1 Thess. ii. 17.

unto the churches] *v.* 2 note.

of Judea which were in Christ] The qualifying phrase prevents any misunderstanding, *v.* 13 note. The Church at Jerusalem had indeed seen St Paul since his conversion (Ac. ix. 29, xi. 30), but he distinguishes Judaea from Jerusalem, as in his speech in Ac. xxvi. 20. Neither here nor in any of the three other passages where 'Judea' occurs in St Paul's writings is there any reason to think that he includes more than approximately the old kingdom of Judah, i.e. that he uses the word in its Roman official sense of the district including Galilee and Samaria. See Introd. p. xxii.

23. *heard*] Presumably from members of the Church at Jerusalem in particular (thus suggesting that his preaching was not contradictory to that of the elder Apostles), as well as from other Christian travellers.

preacheth the faith] Lit. preaches the good news of ('evangelizes') the

faith which once he destroyed. And they glorified God in 24
me. Then fourteen years after I went up again to Jerusalem 2

faith. Cf. *vv.* 8, 16. It is difficult to decide what exactly was in the mind of the speakers. (1) Did they use it in an objective sense, as a synonym of 'the Gospel,' the good news brought, which could be received only by faith? This is the usage, apparently, in Ac. vi. 7, xiii. 8, Jude 3, 20 and sometimes in the Pastoral Epp., e.g. 1 Tim. iv. 1. In this case the 'which' following regards this, so to say, external and objective possession, as laid waste together with those who accept it. Similarly, we say that the Christian faith was stamped out in the greater part of Japan for three hundred years, when the Christians there were, as it was supposed, all extirpated. (2) Or were they thinking of the characteristic of believers, faith subjective in contrast to works? Compare Eph. iii. 17, and 1 Th. iii. 6, the personal faith of the Thessalonians, the good news of which Timothy carried to St Paul. In favour of this is the fact that 'faith' is usually subjective in St Paul's Epp., but seeing that he argues so much in favour of faith, as contrasted with works, we cannot lay stress on any merely numerical comparison of the senses in which it is used. In this case the 'which' regards the subjective faith of believers as injured together with its possessors.

On the whole the former seems to be the more probable.

which once he destroyed] The same word as in *v.* 13.

24. *And they glorified*] The tense suggests that they found continued cause for 'glory.' They kept on recognizing God's handiwork in me and giving Him praise.

God] In the Greek this comes at the end, for emphasis. Certain Jewish Christians now find fault with me. It was not so. The churches of Judaea, who may be supposed to know what was right, were satisfied with what they heard of me and glorified God (Matt. v. 16).

Possibly also the words suggest the reason stated by Theodore of Mopsuestia: 'especially as there is no man who could be shown to be the author of his conversion.'

in me] More than 'in my case.' They found the cause for glory in my person, i.e. my history, words and deeds.

CHAPTER II.

1—10. *The next visit to Jerusalem and its result; my independence was fully recognized.*

(*v.* 1) When did I see the Apostles next? Not till fourteen years after my last visit. I then went up to Jerusalem with so well known a worker as Barnabas for my friend, and with Titus as my attendant. (*v.* 2) It was not however for my own sake, or of my own motion, that I went up. It was in accordance with revelation. And I laid before the believers there a statement of the gospel which I always preach

among the Gentiles (e.g. that it is unnecessary for them to obey the Law), but first privately before the leaders (with the desire to win them over) lest my present or past work should be damaged.

3—5. *A parenthesis, which however illustrates the main subject, referring to an incident which marked an important stage in the history of his stay at Jerusalem.* (*v.* 3) Strong representations were made, by a small but energetic section of Jewish Christians, in favour of circumcision. But not even Titus—my companion, brought therefore into close contact with the Jewish Christians—a Gentile, was circumcised in spite of all their compulsion. (*v.* 4) But because of the nature of that attempt at compulsion, or rather, I say, because of the activity of the false brethren who had been brought in secretly—deserving the title for they came in secretly to act the spy on our liberty in Christ Jesus, that they might enslave us to the Law—(*v.* 5) I say, to these we yielded, as though recognizing their authority—no, not for a moment; in order that the gospel in its integrity might continue with Gentile Christians, including you yourselves.

6—10. *Main subject resumed; his relations with the leaders.* (*v.* 6) But (reverting to *v.* 2) from those reputed to be something (I learned no new truths)—whatever their former personal relation to Christ was is of no matter to me (God Himself is impartial)—I write thus depreciatingly, for the leaders gave no such communication to me as taught me anything fresh; (*v.* 7) but on the contrary when they saw that the commission had been given me to preach the Gospel to the uncircumcised Gentiles in the way that suits them, even as to Peter that to the circumcised Jews in the way that suits them, (*v.* 8) (for He who wrought powerfully for Peter unto fulfilling his apostleship among the circumcision, wrought powerfully for me also among the Gentiles); (*v.* 9) and when they were convinced of the special grace of such preaching that had been given me—they, I mean James, Cephas, and John, who are rightly reckoned as pillars in the Church—gave to me and Barnabas public proof of their sympathy, arranging that we should go unto the Gentiles and they unto the circumcision, (*v.* 10) with the only condition that we should remember the poor saints at Jerusalem, which very thing, both at the time and throughout all the years of my missionary life, I was even zealous to do.

1. *Then* (i. 18, 21) *fourteen years after*] 'After' here marks the time between one event and the next as already passed through before this arrives; Mark ii. 1; Ac. xxiv. 17. So the R.V. 'after the space of,' but R.V. marg. wrongly 'in the course of' fourteen years. The fourteen years date from the last matter of interest, viz. the commencement of the journey to Syria etc. i. 21, which took place at the end of the first visit to Jerusalem, i. 18, 19. So Lightfoot and Zahn. Some (e.g. Ramsay) date it from his conversion, very unnaturally.

I went up] 'Up' primarily of the geographical position of Jerusalem, but the Apostle could hardly fail to think also of its religious superiority. Compare 'the general goes up to-morrow into the Serapeum' in a papyrus of the 2nd cent. B.C. (Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, VII. 5, 1908, p. 184; cf. p. 271). St Paul's visit is doubtless to be identified

with Barnabas, and took Titus with *me* also. And I went 2
up by revelation, and communicated unto them *that* gospel

with that recorded in Ac. xv. On the relation of the two accounts see Appendix, Note B.

again] but not necessarily only a second time. It appears to have been absent from the text of Marcion and Irenaeus.

with Barnabas] Therefore certainly before the separation in Ac. xv. 39. But in itself the fact that Barnabas went with him does not help us to identify the visit, for they were together in all the three visits, Ac. ix. 27, xi. 30 with xii. 25, xv. 2. Barnabas is mentioned here to show that not only St Paul went up, but also one whose orthodoxy no Hebrew Christian doubted. On the inference drawn from his name here by upholders of the South Galatian theory see the Introduction, p. xxx.

and took Titus with me *also*] 'taking Titus also with me,' R.V. The same verb is used in Ac. xii. 25, xv. 37, 38† of John Mark. It signifies taking a dependent, as in LXX. Job i. 4, Job's sons take their sisters, and 3 Mac. i. 1, Philopator takes his sister Arsinoe. Ramsay (*Gal.* p. 294) objects to the translation 'taking...with me,' as though it connoted superiority to Barnabas, but it really only implies that Titus was dependent on St Paul not on Barnabas.

Titus] We know of him only from St Paul's writings, *v.* 3; 2 Cor. (nine times); 2 Tim. iv. 10; Tit. i. 4†: mentioned here because being a full-born Gentile (*v.* 3) and uncircumcised, his was a crucial case. For this very reason also, as we may suppose, St Paul took him with him to Jerusalem. See *v.* 3 note.

2. *And I went up by revelation*] i. 12 note. 'By' here defines the mode by which he knew he was to go up. So Eph. iii. 3. It is not stated to whom the revelation was made. St Paul mentions revelation to show that his journey to Jerusalem was not because of any doubt or difficulty that he himself felt.

and communicated unto them] 'and I laid before them,' R.V. Ac. xxv. 14† (cf. i. 16 note). So 2 Mac. iii. 9, but in Mic. vii. 5 weaker. His communication would include just such a description of his relations to the Gentiles as would be required under the circumstances mentioned in Ac. xv. For the object of his consultation see the last note on this verse.

them] The members of the Church at Jerusalem.

that *gospel which I preach among the Gentiles*] 'The gospel which (as is well known) I preach among the Gentiles,' with the implication that I tell them both how it affects them, and what is and (here emphatically) what is not, expected of them, e.g. that it was not necessary for them to accept the Law of Moses as a condition of their salvation by Christ. In this respect his message would be different from that which he would give to the Jews who were already living under the Law.

which I preach among the Gentiles, but [1]privately to them which were of reputation, lest by any means I should run, or
3 had run, in vain. But neither Titus, who was with me,

[1] Or, *severally*.

but privately] The term is found elsewhere in the N.T. only in the Synoptic Gospels. This clause probably marks an additional communication. He laid it before the whole Church, and also privately before the Three (*v.* 9). 'Severally' in the margin of the A.V. suggests too much, at least in modern English.

to them which were of reputation] 'to them of repute,' 'to the recognized leaders' (Ramsay). Absolutely *v.* 6*b*‡; with an infinitive *vv.* 6*a*, 9 (cf. vi. 3), Mark x. 42; Sus. (LXX. and Th.) 5, 'who were accounted to govern the people'; 4 Mac. xiii. 14, 'let us not fear him who is reputed to kill.' The passages in the LXX. and St Mark have nothing depreciatory in them, nor here in this Epistle. That St Paul is obliged to contradict the excessive honour paid to them by some does not detract from his own opinion that they rightly hold so high a position. The repetition indeed might suggest irony, but it is not like St Paul thus to treat persons whom he respected.

lest by any means] i.e. 'that I might not.' To be connected closely with the immediately preceding clause. He would 'address to the apostles a more thorough and comprehensive statement, and bring forward proofs, experiences, explanations, deeper dialectic deductions etc., which would have been unsuitable for the general body of Christians' (Meyer). It is possible to render the clause as an indirect question, 'Whether I was running or had run in vain?' But this is contrary to St Paul's claim to independence. There is no need to understand 'being afraid.' Moulton, *Proleg.* 1906, p. 193, makes it introduce a separate clause, 'Can it be that' etc.? But this seems quite unnecessary.

I should run ('be running,' R.V.), *or had run, in vain*] i.e. as a messenger carrying news of a victory (Beng.). But the metaphor of the stadium is more probable (cf. v. 7; 1 Cor. ix. 26; Phil. ii. 16). Now was the critical time. If he failed to convince the elder Apostles and through them the Church at Jerusalem of the validity of his Gospel without the Law for the Gentiles, then his work in the present and future would be hindered, and even his past work be damaged. There is no reason to suppose that his fear was for the truth of his teaching, much less that he consulted them as to what he was to teach (Ramsay, *Gal.* p. 296), but for the effect upon his converts if a decision in so respected a quarter as the Church of Jerusalem were given against his teaching.

3—5. *The success of my independent attitude is shown by the case of Titus. Strong representations were made that he should be circumcised. But in vain.*

3. *But*] So far from any hindrance to my work resulting from the interview.

being a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised: and *that* 4
because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came

neither] 'not even,' R.V., in accordance with the true text. Though Titus was both my companion and a Greek.

Titus, who was with me] Actually with me in Jerusalem, exposed to all the opposition. This would be increased by the inconvenience of having a Gentile fellow-believer with whom many Jewish Christians would not even eat.

being a Greek] Greek, not merely Gentile. It would hardly be applied to any non-Jew, e.g. Roman or Egyptian, but only to any Greek-speaking non-Jew, who was, therefore, presumably, of Greek origin. But because Aryan culture and religion had, since the days of Antiochus, come to Judaea by way of Greek-speaking persons, 'Greek' came to mean very nearly 'non-Jew.'

was compelled to be circumcised] Some have strangely laid such stress on 'compelled' as to argue that Titus was circumcised, not compulsorily indeed, but by way of kindly feeling on St Paul's part (see *v.* 5 note). If so he had better have said nothing about it to the Galatians, for he could not well allow him to be circumcised and blame them when they seriously thought of circumcision for themselves. 'Compelled' in reality only suggests the greatness of the pressure brought to bear on St Paul. The form of the sentence suggests that neither the Church at Jerusalem generally nor 'they of repute' brought pressure to bear on the circumcision of so well-known a Gentile as Titus. The attempt of others to secure this failed (see Zahn).

4. *and* that *because of*] Better, 'but *it was* because of,' R.V. marg.; 'which was,' etc. Geneva, 1557. (*a*) This verse and the next most naturally are to be connected closely with *v.* 3, as explanatory of the reason why Titus was not circumcised. St Paul was going to say, But because of the nature of the arguments advanced I did not yield to them, but he alters the form of his sentence in describing the character of those who desired the circumcision of Titus. Jowett writes: 'Altogether, three ideas seem to be struggling for expression in these ambiguous clauses: (1) Titus was not circumcised; (2) though an attempt was made by the false brethren to compel him; (3) which as a matter of principle we thought it so much the more our duty to resist. The ambiguity has arisen from the double connexion in which the clause "because of the false brethren privily brought in" stands, (1) to "was compelled" which precedes, and (2) to "to whom we gave place...no not for an hour" which follows.'

(*b*) It is possible however that St Paul here begins to say 'on the contrary, the attempt to get Titus circumcised led to my official recognition by the recognized leaders of the Church at Jerusalem.' But if so St Paul is a long time in arriving at the point of saying so (*v.* 7).

false brethren‡ unawares brought in] Better, 'the false brethren (2 Cor. xi. 26) who had been brought in secretly': cf. 2 Pet. ii. 1. They had doubtless been brought into the Christian Church by over-

in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ
5 Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage: to whom we
gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour; that the

zealous lovers of the Law. In Strabo XVII. p. 794 the Greek word 'denotes the treacherous introduction of foreign enemies into a city by a faction within the walls' (Rendall). Cf. Polyb. I. 18. 3. It should be noted that Zahn thinks their introduction was not into the Christian Church generally, but into the sphere that belonged in a special sense to St Paul and Barnabas, the Gentile Church of Antioch and its dependent congregations of Syria and Cilicia. Cf. i. 21; Ac. xv. 1, 23.

who] i.e. 'who in fact,' justifying the term 'false brethren.' Rom. ii. 15; Col. ii. 23.

came in privily‡] Rom. v. 20. Cf. Jude 4, and 2 Mac. viii. 1 where Judas Maccabaeus and his friends 'making their way privily into the villages, called unto them their kinsfolk.'

to spy out†] Cf. Heb. xi. 31. To spy out, with the object as it seems of finding out any weak points and thus to injure.

our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus] The first occurrence of the word which best sums up the fundamental thought of the Epistle; cf. v. 1, 13, iv. 22—31. The metaphor would be readily suggested by the universal presence of slaves, cf. iii. 28, and there is no need to see in it a trace of the influence exerted on St Paul by the important school of Stoics at Tarsus (see Clemen, *Primitive Christianity*, etc., 1912, p. 61). It is perhaps not wholly accidental that we have here also the first occurrence in this Epistle of the compound Name in this order: 'in Christ, yes even Jesus.'

our...us] St Paul felt his own liberty, both of action and spiritual life, bound up with that of his converts. Contrast 'you,' *v.* 5.

that they might bring us into bondage] Acts of manumission frequently forbade, under severe penalties, making freedmen slaves again (see Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 235; E. T. p. 329).

5. *to whom we*] I and those with me, in particular Barnabas.

gave place† *by subjection*] 'in the way of subjection,' R.V. The substantive is used in 1 Tim. ii. 11, iii. 4 of those who are in a subordinate position, wives to husbands, children to parents; cf. Col. iii. 18. It thus apparently connotes here that to yield would have been to recognize some authority in his opponents. The false brethren demanded obedience. This he refused to give.

no, not for an hour] The words exclude any such temporary (John v. 35) concession for peace' sake as the circumcision of Titus would have been, even though St Paul had affirmed at the time that by this he did not grant the principle that Gentiles should be circumcised. The omission of 'to whom, no, not' in some 'Western' authorities presupposes the erroneous interpretation of 'was compelled,' *v.* 3. It should be noted that Jerome would then explain the statement as referring to his going up to Jerusalem, i.e. St Paul submitted to go up

truth of the gospel might continue with you. But of these 6
who seemed to be somewhat, (whatsoever they were, it
maketh no matter to me: God accepteth no man's person:)
for they who seemed *to be somewhat* in conference added

for the good of the Church generally; so also B. W. Bacon, perhaps independently, who adopts the 'Western' text.

that the truth of the gospel] *v.* 14; Col. i. 5†. The Gospel in its integrity as compared with Judaistic perversions of it.

might continue] 2 Pet. iii. 4. In the Greek word 'the idea of firm possession is enforced by the compound verb, by the past tense, and by the preposition' (Lightfoot).

with you] i. 18, 'you,' not 'us' (*v.* 4): for he cannot think that he himself will ever doubt the Gospel. You Galatians are a specific instance of the Gentile converts whom I wished to protect. On the false deduction drawn from this phrase see Introd. p. xxviii.

6. *But of* ('from,' R.V.) *these who seemed to be somewhat*] See on *v.* 2. The R.V. marg. 'who are reputed to be somewhat' is better than the past tense of the A.V. and R.V. The Apostle now reverts to *v.* 2, after his parenthesis about Titus (*vv.* 3—5). I conferred privately with those of repute, but (he was going to say) I received nothing fresh from them. The warmth of his feelings, however, leads him to add point to point, so that he never completes this new sentence.

whatsoever they were] i.e. 'whatever kind of persons they once were' (see R.V. marg.). St Paul breaks off in view of a possible objection that he ought to have submitted to the authority of the Twelve who had held the position of personal followers of Christ while He was on earth (see i. 16 note).

it maketh no matter to me] The phrase occurs only here in the Bible.

God accepteth no ('not,' R.V.) *man's person*] This explains why he pays no special regard to the Twelve as such. He is impartial because God is. For the reference to God cf. vi. 7. The phrase 'accept a man's person' is a translation of the Hebrew 'to lift up the face' of a prostrate suppliant, with, probably, the further connotation, from the Greek, of accepting the *mask* for the person, the outside service for the reality. See also Col. iii. 25.

for they who seemed to be somewhat *in conference added nothing to me*] i. 16; cf. *v.* 2. This clause is in the form of another reason why he did not submit to the Twelve—'for, in fact, they did not give me any fresh information'—but at the same time it serves as the completion of the sentence begun by 'But of these,' etc. See note there. The emphasis is on 'me.' Before me they laid nothing by way of communication, i.e. *I* learned nothing from them. I told them much, likely to deepen their knowledge of God's will. They told me nothing of the kind. The R.V. rightly omits 'in conference,' for the thought of consultation is absent here.

7 nothing to me: but contrariwise, when they saw that
the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me,
8 as *the gospel* of the circumcision *was* unto Peter; (for he
that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the
circumcision, *the same* was mighty in me towards the
9 Gentiles:) and when James, Cephas, and John, who seemed

7. *but contrariwise*] So far from adding to my knowledge of the Gospel, they (*a*) accepted my statement of my commission (*v.* 7) and recognized what God had wrought through me (*v.* 9 *a*); (*b*) treated me and Barnabas as in full fellowship (*v.* 9 *b*); (*c*) dividing our spheres of work, that we should go to the Gentiles, and they to the Jews (*v.* 9 *c*).

when they saw] From my statements (*v.* 2). Perhaps also more literally in the person of Titus a fruit of my work.

that the gospel of the uncircumcision] The phrase is unique, but like the following 'of the circumcision.' The difference is probably not solely that of the sphere or direction. Though essentially the Gospel was but one (i. 6, 7), yet both in its presentment and its relation to previous religious training it differed. Tertullian's words in *De Praescr. Haer.* § 23, 'They arranged between them a distribution of duties, not a distinction of gospels, nor that they should preach one one thing, another another, but one to some persons, another to others, Peter to the circumcision, Paul to the Gentiles,' though true in contrast both to Marcionism and to the Tübingen theory, are too narrow. See note on *v.* 2.

was committed unto me] i.e. my work has not been of my own seeking, it has been entrusted to me, 1 Cor. ix. 17; 1 Tim. i. 11; cf. Rom. iii. 2. The perfect suggests 'throughout my ministry.' The R.V. translates more literally 'I had been entrusted with' etc.

Deissmann compares the application of the term to the secretary who was charged by the emperor with his Greek correspondence (ὁ τὰς Ἑλληνικὰς ἐπιστολὰς πράττειν πεπιστευμένος, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 273; E. T. p. 379).

as the gospel *of the circumcision* (Rom. xv. 8) was *unto Peter*] See the note on *Peter*, i. 18.

8. *for*] Justifying his assertion that he had received a commission as Peter had; God wrought for each.

he that wrought effectually in Peter] R.V. more literally, 'he that wrought for Peter.'

So Prov. xxxi. 12 (xxix. 30), 'she worketh her husband good all her life.' Cf. v. 6.

to ('unto,' R.V.) *the apostleship*] Ac. i. 25; Rom. i. 5; 1 Cor. ix. 2†. Not only for the call to it, but also for its fulfilment.

of the circumcision] Genitive marking the sphere in which the apostleship was exercised.

9. *and when James*] Without the addition of 'the brother of the Lord' here, because already so defined in i. 19. Possibly also because at the period referred to in our verse, long after the death of

to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship; that we *should go* unto the heathen, and they unto the circumcision. Only *they would* that we should remember 10
the poor; the same which I also was forward to do.

James the son of Zebedee, there could not be any doubt as to who was intended. Named first of the Three because of his position at Jerusalem, and the stress laid on his name by the false teachers. See *v.* 12 note.

Cephas, and John] i. 18. The last here only in the Pauline Epistles. Among the Twelve James the son of Zebedee had been their only equal (Matt. xvii. 1; Mark v. 37), and sometimes they were even more prominent than he (Luke xxii. 8; Ac. iii. 1 sqq., iv. 13, 19, viii. 14; cf. the order in Ac. i. 13).

who seemed (*vv.* 2, 6 notes) *to be pillars*] For 'pillar' see 1 Tim. iii. 15; Rev. iii. 12, x. 1†. Its metaphorical use occurs in the LXX., as it seems, only in 4 Mac. xvii. 3, apostrophizing the mother of the Seven, 'For thou, as a house nobly set upon the pillar (or "pillars") of thy sons didst endure, without wavering, the shock caused by their tortures.' In T. B. *Berachoth* 28^{b} R. Jochanan ben Zakkai (died *c.* 80 A.D.) is addressed by his disciples 'Lamp of Israel! Right-hand Pillar!'

perceived] 'Saw' (*v.* 7) suggests the immediate impression; 'perceived' the knowledge of reflection (Meyer).

the grace that was given unto me] i.e. to preach to the Gentiles, Eph. iii. 2, 7, 8 (see above, i. 3 note). For 'was given' see also the words in 2 Pet. iii. 15, about St Paul.

they gave...the right hands of fellowship] The Greek phrase is unique in the N.T. but frequent in 1 and 2 Mac., e.g. 1 Mac. vi. 58; 2 Mac. xiv. 19.

Probably a public manifestation of agreement. 'When they bade farewell, it was not a parting like that when Luther in the castle at Marburg rejected the hand of Zwingli, or when Jacob Andreae at Montbéliard refused that of Theodore Beza' (Thiersch quoted by Meyer).

'Fellowship' is here more than the spirit of fellowship and communion, almost our 'brotherliness' (Philem. 6 note), and is strictly 'partnership,' cf. Philem. 17.

to me and Barnabas] The order is that of Ac. xv. 2, 22, 35 (contrast xi. 30, xii. 25).

that we should go] The object of the implied compact; cf. *v.* 10. Observe that the sphere of each is described as ethnographic not geographic, and that it would be impossible to draw the line with accuracy. St Paul does not appear to have taken it in a strict sense.

10. *Only* they would *that we should remember the poor*] 'pore men of crist,' Wyclif. The poor Jewish Christians at Jerusalem for whom in fact St Paul carried alms at least twice, once earlier than this agree-

11 But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to

ment (Ac. xi. 29, 30) and again on his last journey (1 Cor. xvi. 3; 2 Cor. ix. 1 sqq.; Rom. xv. 26, 27; Ac. xxiv. 17) when he wrote this Epistle. Perhaps the mention of the subject here is due to its occupying his mind at the time. See Introd. p. xxiv.

'Remember.' On the one hand he and Barnabas were not to be so absorbed in Gentile work as to forget the needs of the poor believers of their own nation, and, on the other, mercy as twice blessed would foster the sense of unity in both Jewish receivers and Gentile givers.

the same which I also was forward to do] 'I was...zealous,' R.V., 'I was even anxious.'

The singular is employed probably because Barnabas had left him before he was able to carry it out. But the emphasis is not on 'I' but on the verb. The reason for his use of the past tense is not clear. Apparently it regards the whole of his life from his conversion to the present time as belonging to the past. Ramsay strangely limits it to the incidents of his visit to Jerusalem then (*Gal.* p. 300). It perhaps suggests some acquaintance on the part of the Galatians with his feelings on the subject, and so far illustrates 1 Cor. xvi. 1, but throws no light on the relative dates of the two Epistles.

11—14. *My independence of Cephas personally and of Barnabas.*

(*v.* 11) Let me now show you both my independence in rebuking even Cephas and my insistence on the true character of the Gospel. Cephas once came to Antioch, and on that occasion I withstood him to his face, because he was condemned by his own actions. (*v.* 12) For before certain messengers from James came he used to eat with the Gentiles, but when they came he began withdrawing and separating himself, being afraid of both them and others there who were by origin Jews. (*v.* 13) This was really hypocrisy, because his convictions remained unchanged, and he was afraid to express them, and even the rest of the Jewish believers in Antioch became hypocrites with him, so that even Barnabas was carried away with their hypocrisy. (*v.* 14) I stood alone. But when I saw that they were not walking with straight steps in accordance with the Gospel in its integrity, I said to Peter in the presence of all, Thou art a Jew by race and yet usually livest like a Gentile, how dost thou now (by this action of thine in withdrawing from Gentiles, insisting as it does on the grave importance of the Jewish Law) put this moral pressure upon Gentile believers to practise Judaism?

11. *But when Peter was come to Antioch*] 'But when Cephas came to Antioch,' R.V. When was this? (1) If after the Council of Jerusalem it must have been during the period mentioned in Ac. xv. 35, for we have no reason to think that St Barnabas and St Paul were ever together after that time. But it seems quite impossible that St Peter and even St Barnabas (*v.* 13) should refuse to eat with Gentiles almost immediately after that Council, where it was expressly decided that the Gentiles were not bound by the Law as such, and after, in particular, St Peter's strong defence of their freedom. However impetuous

St Peter may have been this is to attribute to him an incredible degree of weakness. The fact that the scene is in Antioch, where, according to this theory, the question had already come to a head and had been referred to Jerusalem, makes the impossibility greater. It has indeed been urged (Steinmann, *Abfassungszeit*, pp. 133—136) that the Council decided as a question of doctrine that Gentile Christians were not bound to be circumcised and keep the Law, and that here is a question of practice, whether Jewish Christians were defiled by eating with Gentile Christians. But a negative answer to this question of practice was the only logical deduction from the decision on the doctrine. Hort indeed supposes that St Peter's policy of withdrawal from social intercourse with the Gentile Christians was due to no antagonism of principle but to 'a plea of inopportuneness: "more important to keep our Jerusalem friends in good humour than to avoid every possible risk of estranging your new Gentile converts: no need to reject them or to tell them to be circumcised, but no need either for us Jews to be publicly fraternising with them, now that we know what offence that will give at Jerusalem: better wait awhile and see whether things do not come right of themselves if only we are not in too great a hurry." Plausible reasoning this would have been, and some sort of plausible reasoning there must have been to ensnare Barnabas and indeed to delude St Peter himself. But what it amounted to was that multitudes of baptized Gentile Christians, hitherto treated on terms of perfect equality, were now to be practically exhibited as unfit company for the circumcised Apostles of the Lord who died for them. Such judiciousness, St Paul might well say, was at bottom only moral cowardice; and such conduct, though in form it was not an expulsion of the Gentile converts, but only a self-withdrawal from their company, was in effect a summons to them to become Jews, if they wished to remain in the fullest sense Christians' (*Judaistic Christianity*, p. 78). Further, Jewish Christians might have argued that the decision of the Council did not affect their obligations to abstain from unclean foods, but recognized two bodies in the Christian Church, Jewish and Gentile, with equal privileges but incomplete social connexion. If so it was extremely illogical and likely soon to lead to bitter resentment on the side of the Gentile Christians. But of this resentment there seems to be no trace. (2) We are therefore almost compelled to place it before the date of the Council. This agrees with St Paul's description of St Peter's previous life (*v.* 14), explained to us by the account in Acts of his relations to Cornelius, x. and xi. 3. The only difficulty is the position of the incident in our Epistle, where *vv.* 1—10 have described the scenes at Jerusalem during the Council, Ac. xv. 4—29 (see Appendix, Note B). But St Paul does not now write 'then,' and save for the position there is nothing to indicate an intention to place *vv.* 11—14 chronologically later than *vv.* 1—10. The probability is that having described his relations with the Church at Jerusalem and in particular the Three, he now speaks of his relations with St Peter individually and even Barnabas. As we know that the question agitated the Church at Antioch, where it was caused by the same means as those described here (those 'who came from James'

12 the face, because he was *to be* blamed. For before that

(*v.* 12) being identified with those 'who came down from Judaea,' Ac. xv. 1, or from 'us,' Ac. xv. 24), it is most natural to suppose that the incident here described formed an important part of that agitation, and in consequence that it took place during the period described in Ac. xv. 1, 2. The effect on Barnabas appears to have been immediate, Ac. xv. 2. It was also probably immediate on St Peter, but we only know that he argues on St Paul's side during the Council, Ac. xv. 7—11.

Ramsay now strangely places it before even the first missionary journey of St Paul and Barnabas, and thinks that St Peter 'was sent from Jerusalem as far as Syrian Antioch to inspect and report upon this new extension of the Church [to Antioch !], just as he had been sent previously to Samaria along with John on a similar errand' (*Cities of St Paul*, pp. 302 sq.).

Two curious theories of the incident, made to save St Peter's credit, may be worth mention: (1) The Cephas here mentioned is one of the Seventy and a different person from St Peter (Clement of Alexandria in Eusebius, *Ch. Hist.* I. 12. 2). (2) The 'dispute' was got up for the occasion. St Peter feared that it would be difficult to persuade the Jewish Christians (who accepted him as their teacher) to treat the Gentiles rightly. He therefore pretended to be on their side in order that when openly rebuked by St Paul *without making any defence* his followers might change their opinion more easily. So Chrysostom 687 C—E; cf. 688 B. Jerome, who held this theory till convinced of its untenableness by Augustine, attributes its invention to Origen (see Lightfoot's additional note on *Patristic accounts of the collision at Antioch*).

I withstood him] 2 Tim. iii. 8, iv. 15; Ac. xiii. 8.

to the face] 'face to face,' Ac. xxv. 16.

because he was to be *blamed*] 'because he stood condemned,' R.V. (1) By his own contradictory actions, as St Paul explains. (2) Perhaps by his own conscience. So Ecclus. xiv. 2, 'Blessed is he whose soul doth not condemn him,' and in the only other passages where the Greek word occurs in the N.T.: 1 John iii. 20, 21 (cf. Rom. xiv. 23). (3) It is possible that it refers to blame by others for his inconsistency ('denn es war Klage über ihn kommen,' Luther), in which case 'because' will state the reason for the publicity of the rebuke. (4) Field, *Notes on the Translation of the New Testament*, still prefers the *reprehensibilis* of the Vulg. and the rendering of the A.V.

12. *For before that certain came from James*] Ac. xv. 24 makes it probable that 'from James' is to be taken with 'certain' rather than with 'came.' If so there is no need to ask why St James *sent* them to Antioch. They were from him, perhaps on a tour to get alms for the poor, but they did not come with any special message to Antioch. In Ac. xv. 5 those who assert the necessity of keeping the Law are said to have belonged once to the sect of the Pharisees. Hort, understanding

certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles: but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision. And the other 13 Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation. But when I 14

St Peter's visit to Antioch to have taken place after the Council at Jerusalem, rather strangely supposes 'from James' to imply that St James himself suggested that St Peter ought not to eat with Gentile Christians for fear of giving further offence to the Jewish Church at Jerusalem, and that St Paul, notwithstanding, had no occasion to include St James in his rebuke because the latter had made no public exhibition of 'dissimulation' at Antioch (*Judaistic Christianity*, p. 81).

he did eat with the Gentiles] The tense of 'didst eat' in Ac. xi. 3 marked some days at most, but of the verb here a long period. No good Jew eats with Gentiles, because Gentile food is 'unclean.'

he withdrew ('drew back,' R.V.) *and separated himself*] The Greek tenses 'give a graphic picture of Peter's irresolute and tentative efforts to withdraw gradually from an intercourse that gave offence to the visitors' (Rendall).

'Separated himself,' 'departid him,' Wyclif. i. 15 note. Possibly here also there is some play on the word, as though Peter were changing himself into a Pharisee. Whether this be so or not it is a semi-technical word in the LXX. for separation from unclean things, implying that St Peter regarded Gentile Christians under this category (cf. Isa. lii. 11; Lev. xx. 25, 26).

fearing them which were of the circumcision] Chrysostom (688 B) in accordance with his strange theory of accommodation (*vide supra*, *v.* 11) thinks that his fear was not for himself but for these Jewish Christians, lest they should leave the faith.

13. *And*] Omitted by B, Vulg., Origen, probably to limit the hypocrisy to the Jews, excluding St Peter.

the other Jews] Here of course 'Jews' is used of Christians who were Jews by race. Cf. Rom. ii. 10. So St Paul of himself, Ac. xxi. 39.

dissembled‡ likewise with him] i.e. played the hypocrite. For such an action was contrary to their real convictions. 'The idea at the root of ["hypocrisy"] is not a false motive entertained, but a false impression produced' (Lightfoot). Cf. 2 Mac. vi. 24, Eleazar says 'It becometh not our years to dissemble.'

insomuch that Barnabas also] St Paul thus shows his independence even of him.

was carried away] 2 Pet. iii. 17, but in Rom. xii. 16† in a wholly good sense. Here 'their dissimulation was as a flood which swept everything away with it' (Lightfoot).

14. *But when I saw*] In his zeal for his Master, as he saw men carried off, his feelings must have faintly resembled those which prompted the question in John vi. 67.

saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before *them* all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the

that they walked not uprightly‡] In Greek the present tense for vividness. The verb means 'to be straight-footed.' Such a man is not lame, but makes 'straight paths with his feet.' 'Ils ne marchaient pas de droit pied' (Ostervald). It therefore suggests not only the crooked walk, but the crooked track thereby made, likely to lead others astray.

the truth of the gospel] *v.* 5 note. The clause is epexegetic of 'uprightly.'

I said unto Peter ('Cephas,' R.V.) *before* them *all*] Probably at a meeting of the whole Church at Antioch, the majority of which seems to have been in favour of St Paul (Ac. xv. 3). 'Publicum scandalum non poterat privatim curari' (Pelagius in Zahn); cf. 1 Tim. v. 20.

If thou, being (i. 14 note) *a Jew*] *v.* 13; iii. 28. Col. iii. 11 note. The word refers first to nationality and race, but here has also the connotation of observance of religious customs.

livest] i.e. ordinarily, and when not under the influence of this 'dissimulation.'

why ('how,' R.V.) *compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?*] Observe that St Paul does not merely argue that St Peter is inconsistent, but that his inconsistency affects the Gentiles. 'The force of his example, concealing his true principles, became a species of compulsion' (Lightfoot).

15—21. *His argument addressed to St Peter passes over into one addressed to the Galatians* (see below). *The transition was the easier because the temptation to which the Galatians were exposed was identical with that to which St Peter had temporarily yielded, i.e. the belief that observance of the Law was necessary for Gentile Christians.*

(*v.* 15) We, you and I, with other Jewish Christians, who are by nature Jews, and not open sinners from amongst Gentiles, (*v.* 16) but (in spite of our education as Jews), knowing that a man is not justified from works of the Law[1], not justified, I mean, save by faith on Christ Jesus, even we became believers on Christ Jesus, in order that we may be justified from faith in Christ, and not from works of the Law, because (as Scripture tells us) from works of the Law 'no flesh shall be justified.' (*v.* 17) It is not wrong to leave the Law for this purpose. But if when seeking to be justified in Christ we were found (in our own experience and conscience) to be as much sinners as Gentiles are—is this Christ's fault, does He make us sinners? God forbid! (*v.* 18) The sin would be to build up what one has pulled down, i.e. go back to the Law. Then indeed I should prove myself a transgressor (*v.* 19) of even the

[1] After much consideration it seems better to insert the article, as less likely to mislead the English reader. For St Paul is not thinking of Law in general (as the Duke of Argyle wrote of the Reign of Law), but of the Mosaic Law, even though he is regarding that as law (see Appendix, Note E).

Jews? We *who are* Jews by nature, and not sinners of the 15
Gentiles, knowing that a man is not justified by the works of 16

Law that brought me to Christ. For indeed I myself by means of the Law died to the Law, that I might live to God. (*v.* 20) Died! yes, with Christ I have been crucified. Live! yes, after all I live, yet it is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me. But as to my living now in the flesh, I live in faith, namely faith on the Son of God who loved me and gave Himself for me. (*v.* 21) I do not set the free grace of God at nought. For if righteousness is by means of the Law (as St Peter said by his action, and as the Judaizers in Galatia tell you) then Christ died without cause.

It is not certain where the transition between the words to St Peter and those to the Galatians actually takes place. W.H. make a division between *vv.* 14, 15, and if a division must be made in print this is perhaps the best place to put it, for *v.* 15 begins a sustained argument. But it is hard to think that *v.* 15 was originally addressed to Gentile Christians such as the Galatians, though it is natural enough if spoken to St Peter. Perhaps the real transition, from the recapitulation of St Paul's words to St Peter to the argument addressed directly to the Galatians, is near the end of *v.* 16, before 'for by the works of the law.' But it may be between *vv.* 18, 19.

15. *We*] i.e. originally (*vide supra*) 'You Peter and I Paul.' But perhaps as written in the Epistle 'I Paul and my fellow-Jewish Christians.' It is taken up in the 'we' of *v.* 16.

who are *Jews by nature* (iv. 8), *and not sinners of the Gentiles*] The common Jewish view (see Bousset, *Religion des Judentums im N.T. Zeitalter*, 1906, p. 489), fully shared by St Paul (Rom. i. 18—32), is doubtless true. The Gentiles in fact were more sinful than Jews as regards gross sins, and are so still, in so far as they are not influenced by Christianity. St Paul calls them 'without law' (Rom. ii. 12) as well as 'without God' (Eph. ii. 12). Cf. 1 Mac. i. 34, ii. 44. Observe that he does not call them 'transgressors' (*parabatai*), which would imply conscious resistance to a clearly perceived moral requirement (*v.* 18), but 'sinners' (*hamartōloi*), i.e. men out of harmony with the moral ideal known or unknown (B. W. Bacon).

16. *knowing*] The 'yet' prefixed by the R.V. is found in the best manuscripts, and suggests a contrast to natural privileges and prejudices.

There are two words for 'know' in Greek, one of acquired knowledge (iv. 9), the other of elementary and intuitive knowledge. It is the latter (iv. 8) which is used here.

justified] The first occurrence of this word (or its derivatives) which is so characteristic of this Epistle. It is used throughout in its 'forensic' sense of 'pronouncing righteous,' 'justifying,' not in the ethical sense of 'making righteous,' a meaning which some scholars think it never possesses. See Sanday and Headlam, *Rom.* pp. 30 sq.

by] This little word occurs five times in this verse. In all but the second example it represents 'of,' i.e. the source (whether false or true)

the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law: for by the

of 'righteousness,' 'justification.' In the second example it is the means, 'by means of' (as in *v.* 21). In *v.* 17 it is properly 'in.'

the works of the law] The genitive 'of the law' is neither subjective, as though the Law produced works, nor objective, as though the aim of works were to fulfil the Law, but possessive, works which belong to, and are required by, the Law (Sieffert). In the Greek there is no article before either 'works' or 'law.' Hence the R.V. margin 'works of law.' But probably the A.V. and R.V. text give the true *nuance*. See Appendix, Note E.

but] 'save,' R.V. rightly as a verbal translation, though misleading. To be joined with 'is not justified.' 'But only' (R.V. marg.) gives the sense.

The Roman Catholic commentators join 'but' to 'by the works of the law,' explaining that we are justified by works done by means of faith. But this is to make under other terms that mixture of Law and Grace against which this Epistle is directed; cf. iii. 11, 12. Compare the Introd. c. VI.

by the faith of] i.e. as R.V. 'through faith in.'

even we] with all our privileges, taking up the 'we' of *v.* 15.

believed in] 'on,' R.V. The exact phrase of the Greek, though common in St John's writings, occurs in St Paul's only here and Rom. x. 14; Phil. i. 29. It has, as it seems, with him the same strong sense as with St John, to cease to lean on oneself and to place one's entire trust on Christ.

that we might be justified by the faith of Christ] 'by faith in Christ,' R.V.; 'by' is here properly 'of' (see above). It is stronger than the preceding 'through,' and excludes all sources of justification other than faith on Christ.

The omission of 'Jesus' may be due only to a wish to avoid repetition, but perhaps to a desire to emphasize the thought that a true Jew finds his justification in Messiah. Cf. *v.* 4 note on 'in Christ Jesus.'

and not by the works of the law] Better, 'and not from works of the law' (see above). No, not even from the moral works. Indeed, from one point of view, the burden of the Law lies in its moral, not its ceremonial side (cf. Rom. vii. 7 sqq.). 'In itself the ceremonial law was not a yoke too heavy to be borne, but it derived its strength from the moral (Ac. xv.). Thus the moral law is *more legal*, so to speak, than the ceremonial, which was also at the same time, as it were, an elementary and preliminary Gospel' (Bengel).

This is a hard saying to Jews who wonder that St Paul can speak of the burden of the Law, when their Rabbis rejoice in learning a fresh duty of it for their accomplishment (Güdemann, *Jüd. Apologetik*, 1906, pp. 190 sq.; cf. Schechter, *Some Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*, 1909, pp. 149 sqq.), as though the Law were a bundle of laws by which to

works of the law shall no flesh be justified. But if, while we 17
seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found
sinners, *is* therefore Christ the minister of sin? God forbid.

acquire merit. But St Paul is thinking of the inner demands on conscience and the soul made by the Law as the revelation of holiness, and the Rabbis show little sense of humility or self-knowledge.

Observe the difference of St Paul's language from 4 (2) Esdras ix. 7, 'every one that shall be saved, and shall be able to escape by his works, or by faith, whereby he hath believed, shall be preserved,' or xiii. 23, 'even such as have works, and faith toward the Almighty' (see examples of pre-Christian Jewish statements of the value of faith in Bousset, *Religion des Judentums*, 1906, pp. 223 sqq.). Compare the notes on iii. 10.

for] Introducing a proof from Scripture for his assertion of the insufficiency of the Law.

by the works of the law] i.e. 'from the source of works of the Law.'

shall no flesh be justified] A quotation, not quite literal, from Ps. cxliii. 2. Literally 'there shall not be justified—any flesh at all.' A Hebraism for our more prosaic 'no flesh shall be justified.' 'All flesh' is itself a Hebraism for 'all men,' Gen. vi. 12.

17. *But if*] The adversative thought is that in the process of being justified we are found to be sinners.

while we seek] 'sought,' R.V. The effort was real and lasting.

we ourselves] Parallel to 'even we' (*v.* 16), even we Jews who passed over from Judaism to faith on Christ, and also were seeking etc.

are ('were') *found*] The tense may be 'timeless,' but more probably refers to the time when we first sought etc. 'Were found' is more than 'were'; it includes acknowledgment; if we were found by our own experience, Rom. vii. 10. The mere effort to be justified in Christ proved to us that as far as the demands of the Law went we were still sinners.

sinners] *v.* 15, i.e. no better than Gentiles. When seeking to be justified we came to recognize our sinfulness as no less than that of Gentiles.

is *therefore*] Here of an argument which is only superficially true.

Christ the minister of sin?] Does Christ bring us into a condition of real sin? There is a double thought: Does the consciousness of being sinners make us more sinners than before, and, if so, is it Christ's fault that we are worse sinners?

God forbid] Literally 'may it not be!' For the use of this when an argument followed out to its apparently logical conclusion is seen to be contrary to the elements of the Christian faith cf. iii. 21; Rom. xi. 1 al.

Other interpretations of this difficult verse are:

(*a*) St Paul is arguing that if by leaving the Law we become in the sight of God sinners (which we do not) then Christ brings sin, which is absurd; i.e. St Paul is showing that it cannot be wrong to

18 For if I build again the *things* which I destroyed, I make
19 myself a transgressor. For I through the law am dead to

abandon the Law. *v.* 18 then means, as with the first and right interpretation of *v.* 17, that not leaving the Law, but returning to it, is wrong.

(*b*) The verse represents the thought of an objector. If to be justified in Christ means to leave the Law (a sinful action), and thus to be in sight of God and man no better than a Gentile, Christ becomes a minister of sin. St Paul answers, God forbid. But *v.* 18 is then unintelligible.

(*c*) If when seeking etc. we do commit sins, Christ cannot be blamed for this. We are to be blamed (*v.* 18) because it is contrary to our profession and earlier action.

18. *For*] to be taken closely with 'God forbid,' Rom. ix. 14, 15, xi. 1. It is not sinful to abandon the Law in seeking justification, and thus to find oneself on the same level as a sinful Gentile, *for* the sin is in going back to the Law, as you Galatians are thinking of doing.

if I build again the things *which I destroyed*] For a similar contrast between 'destroy' and 'build' cf. Mark xiv. 58 (‖ Matt. xxvi. 61), where however the *nuance* is quite different. The singular may be due (1) to St Paul's courtesy in excluding others from the possibility of doing wrong (some critics, e.g. Winer-Schmiedel, § 22. 1, think he purposely thus transferred St Peter's action to himself); or, better, (2) to his habit of referring possible spiritual experiences and their effect to himself (e.g. iv. 6). If this be right he naturally passes on to state what has in fact been his experience (*v.* 19).

I make myself] 'prove myself' (R.V.), show myself, 2 Cor. vii. 11; cf. Rom. iii. 5, v. 8.

The phrase is stronger than 'I am proved.' It means 'I, by my own act of rebuilding an error once pulled down, prove even myself in the wrong. I stand convicted by my own new act, yes, as a transgressor of the Law itself' (cf. *v.* 19).

a transgressor] Rom. ii. 25, 27; James ii. 9, 11†; cf. 'transgressions,' iii. 19 note and above *v.* 15. A transgressor of God's will which has been laid down as a path in which to walk.

19. *For I*] 'I,' not I in contrast to St Peter (Winer-Schmiedel, see note on 'destroyed' *v.* 18), but I in my own experience. 'For' gives the reason for his statement that it was sinful to go back to the Law. My own experience has been that the Law was not a positive but only a negative means of blessing. The Law itself made me leave the Law.

through the law am dead ('died,' R.V.) *to the law, that I might live unto God*] A fundamental fact with St Paul. The Law itself (not Law in the abstract, *v.* 16 note, but the Law as law) brought me to this state of death to it. The Law itself showing me my weakness and inability to fulfil it brought me to such a state of exhaustion as regards

the law, that I might live unto God. I am crucified with 20
Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth

fulfilling its commands that my efforts altogether ceased—in order that I might live (in the fullest sense of life) not to it, but to God. The utter condemnation experienced by him who conscientiously endeavours to keep the moral demands of God's Law drives him to seek deliverance in God Himself (cf. Rom. vii. 7 sqq.). This deliverance found, life in the highest sense (Col. iii. 3, 4 notes) begins.

20. The first half of this verse is an expansion of the meaning of both the death and the life mentioned in *v.* 19. I died to the Law for I have been crucified with Christ; I live to God, for Christ lives in me.

Observe also that (1) the verse brings out the greatness of the Gospel which the Galatians are inclined to reject. Life is not in the Law and yet you would go back to it! Life *is* in Christ, and that fully. (2) While in cc. i. and ii. St Paul has spoken much of Christ's call to him, so that he was independent of the Twelve, here he shows what Christ can become in the inner life of believers. I died, it is true, but it was with Christ; I live, nay to put it more truly, Christ lives in me.

I am ('have been,' R.V.) *crucified with Christ*] The compound verb only here and Rom. vi. 6 (to be compared closely) in St Paul's writings, in both places metaphorically, and in the account of the crucifixion in Matthew, Mark, John literally†. The metaphorical sense of the simple verb occurs in v. 24, vi. 14†.

Observe that the cross has the connotation not only of death but also of shame. It is the antithesis to the self-estimation of the successful Jew i. 13, 14.

But how was St Paul crucified with Christ? He went over to Christ's side, took his position with Him in His shame, venturing all on Him, passing in spirit with Him as He endured pain and death. St Paul's old life thus came to an end, and he shared the new resurrection life on which Christ entered. See Rom. vii. 1—7 where this is expressed fully.

The perfect suggests that the crucifixion has had an abiding result upon him. He has never been the same since. 'I am ficchid (fixed) to the cros,' Wyclif. 'I am nailed to the crosse,' Rheims.

nevertheless I live; yet not I] But my crucifixion has not been only for death, it has been for life. The emphasis on 'live,' shown by the order of the Greek words, forbids the translation 'and it is no longer I that live,' R.V. margin, in which the emphasis is on the death of his own personality. As it is the meaning is that of the somewhat clumsy R.V. text, 'yet I live; *and yet* no longer I.'

but Christ liveth in me] There seems to be no exact parallel, but cf. iv. 19 note; Col. iii. 4; Rom. vi. 8; 1 John v. 12; John vi. 54, 57, xi. 25, xiv. 6, xvii. 23; also Eph. iii. 17. Of course St Paul does not mean that his former personality is gone, but that Christ, not self,

in me: and *the life* which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave him-
21 self for me. I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness *come* by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.

rules, and Christ lives in him, giving both power and character to his life.

now] in contrast to the time before his conversion; hardly to the future.

live] Observe that St Paul refers to the principle of life, not to its circumstances, manner, or interest. Contrast Col. ii. 20, iii. 7.

in the flesh] epexegetic of *live*; cf. Phil. i. 22.

I live by the faith] The right emphasis is 'in faith do I live, *the faith* which is in.' He lives in faith as contrasted with the Law, but, after all, a certain kind of faith, that which is directed towards Christ.

the Son of God] The word 'Christ' is not sufficient for St Paul. For the higher the nature of Him who sacrifices Himself the greater seems the love that prompts Him.

who loved me] Only here, in this sense, with the object in the singular, but frequently with the plural, e.g. Rom. viii. 37.

and gave himself ('up,' R.V.) *for me*] Rom. iv. 25; Eph. v. 2, 25. St Paul in the enthusiasm of his personal gratitude to Christ seems to have wandered from his subject. Yet nothing was more likely to win the Galatians back to steadfastness in the Gospel than to remind them of Christ's love, and that for each individually. In fact the self-sacrifice of Christ, in His life and in His death, has always been both the origin of the Christian's life and the model set before him; see the references to Eph.: see also *infra* vi. 2 note.

21. A summary of *vv.* 15—20, and indeed of the whole Epistle. I do not set at nought God's grace, as you think of doing. There is no righteousness by means of the Law. If there were, Christ died and gained nothing thereby.

I do not frustrate] In St Paul's writings, iii. 15; 1 Cor. i. 19 (a quotation); 1 Thess. iv. 8 (where see note); 1 Tim. v. 12†. It is strictly 'to set out of position,' i.e. 'set aside,' 'set at nought.' Cf. Lk. x. 16; 1 Sam. ii. 17; Isa. i. 2. 'It describes not only the violation of an ordinance or authority in details, but the denial of the validity of the ordinance or the authority altogether' (Westcott on Heb. x. 28); cf. 1 Mac. xv. 27. In the papyri the substantive is used in a technical juristic sense (Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 228).

the grace of God] i. 15.

for if righteousness come *by the law*] See *v.* 16 notes.

then (v. 11 note) *Christ is dead in vain*] 'died for nought,' R.V. Without receiving any payment for His pains and sacrifice, in your salvation taking place through Him: Gen. xxix. 15; 2 Cor. xi. 7; i.e. without any due cause, John xv. 25.

O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that *you* 3

CHAPTER III.

iii.—v. 12. A CLEAR DOCTRINAL STATEMENT OF SALVATION BY FAITH, WITH RENEWED APPEALS.

1—6. *Your very reason, and your own experience, should tell you the all-importance of faith.*

(*v.* 1) Unreasoning Galatians! who hath 'overlooked' you? when you had a full counter charm—Jesus Christ displayed in front of you as crucified!

(*vv.* 2—5) I appeal to your own experience. (*v.* 2) Were the deeds of the Law the source from which you heathen converts received the Spirit at first, or was it your hearing in faith? (*v.* 3) Are you so utterly unreasoning? You made a beginning by the spirit and will you now make an end by the flesh? (*v.* 4) Are too your many sufferings for the Gospel's sake to have been endured without due result? I cannot think it. (*v.* 5) So too with your present experience of the Spirit and of miracles—are they given you from deeds of the Law or from hearing in faith?

(*v.* 6) You know the answer, it was all from faith, even as in the case of Abraham himself, to whom the Jews are always appealing; it was his faith that brought him righteousness.

1. *O foolish*] *v.* 3. The term is suggested by the logical argument of ii. 14—21. The mixture of Judaism with faith in Christ was there shown to be irrational. The Galatians ought to have had enough mental ability to see this of themselves.

Galatians] The personal appeal by name occurs in St Paul's writings elsewhere only in 2 Cor. vi. 11; Phil. iv. 15; 1 Tim. i. 18, vi. 20; in all of which it is not due to indignation, but (certainly in 1 Tim. and probably in the other two passages) to deep emotion. Yet in none does a reproachful adjective precede, so that they are not quite like our passage, where the context suggests a holy indignation rather than extreme tenderness of affection.

who hath bewitched you?] 'who did bewitch you,' R.V. For the form of argument see v. 7. The Greek tense (aorist) is timeless, idiomatically translated by our perfect. The word translated 'bewitch' occurs here only in the N.T. In the O.T. generally of 'envy' or 'grudging,' e.g. Deut. xxviii. 54; Prov. xxiii. 6; and even Ecclus. xiv. 6—8. But in Wisd. iv. 12 'bewitching' in a metaphorical sense. Here also 'bewitch' or 'overlook' is intended, the allusion being to the 'evil eye' ('fascinavit,' Vulg.) of folk-lore in perhaps all parts of the world, especially Babylon and Syria. See further in *Jewish Encyc.* v. 280 and Lightfoot. An adjective formed from the same Greek verb is found in the formula of greeting in the papyri = may all mischief be kept far from thee. This adjective occurs as a proper name, or rather by-name, in an inscription found some twenty miles south of Lystra in 1909, and

should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ
2 hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you? This
only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the

an additional argument for the South Galatian theory has been drawn from this fact, which, in view of the widespread character of the superstition, can hardly be maintained. If there is any notion of 'envy' or 'grudging' in our verse it is quite subordinate, for the following clause refers to the popular superstition. See *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, s.v. Evil Eye.

that you *should not obey the truth*] Omitted by the R.V. with nearly all the old authorities. It was taken from v. 7.

before whose eyes Jesus hath been evidently set forth] 'was openly set forth,' R.V. (i) In Rom. xv. 4; Eph. iii. 3 the Greek verb means 'to write beforehand,' and so even in Jude 4† (of ungodly men written down beforehand in the Divine tablets or perhaps in the Book of Enoch quoted by Jude, *vv.* 14, 15). So perhaps here, written beforehand either by the Prophets, or (though very improbably) by an earlier letter received by the Galatians from St Paul or others.

(ii) But the meaning of publicity is better.

(*a*) 'It is the common word to describe all public notices or proclamations, e.g. Arist. *Birds* 450, 'whatever we publish on the notice-boards' (see Lightfoot). In this case the metaphor is that the name of Jesus Christ has been officially posted up as of one crucified.

(*b*) Even this, however, hardly satisfies the thought suggested by the preceding words. Although there seems to be no example of the word actually meaning 'paint,' or 'depict,' yet this connotation, as often with our 'placard,' would suit admirably. So the Peshito Syriac 'who was as it were surely portrayed'; Philox. 'prius depictus est,' and so Chrys., who enlarges eloquently upon the several details of the picture: 'whom they saw stripped for their sake, set on the cross, nailed to it, being spat upon, being mocked, being given vinegar to drink, being accused by robbers, being pierced with a lance; for St Paul described all these many things when he said "He was portrayed crucified among you"' (see Field, *Notes on N.T.*). As the open hand (still often seen on Syrian houses) wards off the evil eye, so ought this placard of Christ to have warded off for you the 'fascination' of these false teachers.

The strange rendering of Wyclif 'to for whose iyen ihesus crist is *exilid*' is due to his Latin MSS. reading 'proscriptus' (so Sixtine Vulg., and Rheims 'was proscribed') instead of 'praescriptus' (so Clementine Vulg.).

crucified] The predicate as in 1 Cor. i. 23, ii. 2. Contrast Mt. xxviii. 5. Why did He die if you were to go back to the Law (ii. 21)?

among you] Omitted in R.V., and all the old authorities.

2. *learn*] i.e. ascertain. Luther wrongly insists on its strongest meaning, 'Go to now, answer me, I pray you, which am your scholar (for ye are so suddenly become Doctors, that ye are my masters and teachers)' (p. 98[b]).

Received ye the Spirit] They knew this partly by the miracles that

works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Are ye so 3
foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect
by the flesh? Have ye suffered [1]so many *things* in vain? if 4

[1] Or, *so great.*

took place, *v.* 5. The outpouring of the Holy Spirit took place so generally that the coincidence of Ac. xiii. 52 proves little for the South Galatian theory. Bp Chase thinks this refers to confirmation (*Confirmation in the Apostolic Age*, pp. 85 sqq.).

by the works of the law] ii. 16 note. It was not the excellence of your life.

or by the hearing of faith] *v.* 5; cf. Rom. x. 17; also 1 Thess. ii. 13; Heb. iv. 2. 'Hearing' here is not passive, 'the message which treats of faith' (cf. R.V. marg. Mt. iv. 24; John xii. 38, a quotation; and probably Heb. iv. 2), but active, the power and exercise of hearing (1 Cor. xii. 17; 2 Tim. iv. 3; 2 Pet. ii. 8). 'Of faith' is appended almost as an epithet, 'hearing marked by faith.' Thus 'hearing' is contrasted with 'works' and 'faith' with 'the law.' 'Exquisite sic denotatur natura fidei, non operantis, sed recipientis' (Beng.). Faith is receptive, works productive.

So Luther, 'The Law never bringeth the Holy Ghost, but only teacheth what we ought to do: therefore it justifieth not. But the Gospel bringeth the Holy Ghost, because it teacheth what we ought to receive. ...Now, to exact and to give, to take and to offer are things contrary, and cannot stand together. ...Therefore if the Gospel be a gift, it requireth nothing. Contrariwise, the law giveth nothing, but it requireth and straightly exacteth of us, yea even impossible things' (p. 102[a]).

3. *begun...made perfect*] 'perfected,' R.V. The two verbs occur also in the encouraging passage Phil. i. 6 (see also 2 Cor. viii. 6). There is no reason to think they are employed here with a reference to the performance of sacrificial or religious rites.

in (better 'by') *the Spirit*] See Appendix, Note F.

made perfect] 'perfected,' R.V. The sense is probably not passive, but 'middle,' 'are ye now making an end?' cf. R.V. marg. So the Peshito Syriac. Tyndale 'ye wolde nowe ende.'

by the flesh] This does not mean that St Paul granted that there was any spiritual growth by means of circumcision, nor does it imply that this was all that the false teachers meant, as though they said that it was necessary for the higher stages of the Christian life; but it is St Paul's way of expressing his *reductio ad absurdum*. Begin by the spirit, and bring things to completion by the flesh! In v. 2 he states plainly enough that circumcision for them would be to lose all profit in Christ.

4. He has spoken of their past experience of spiritual blessings; now he appeals to their past sufferings.

so many] The frequency of the persecutions rather than their severity. They came not from the Judaizing Christians (for we have no

5 *it be* yet in vain. He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, *doeth he it* by the
6 works of the law, or by the hearing of faith? Even as Abraham believed God, and it was [1]accounted to

[1] Or, *imputed.*

hint that they persecuted in the ordinary sense of the word) but from Jews. No information of these troubles has come down to us. The notices of Ac. xiv. 2, 5, 22 refer to South Galatians.

in vain] 'without due result,' iv. 11; 1 Cor. xv. 2. If you fall away.

if it be *yet in vain*] 2 Cor. v. 3. He cannot give up hope.

5. Here he appeals to their present experience. For 'frequently abstract teaching may be verified by reference to our own spiritual life' (Beet).

He therefore] In logical deduction from *v.* 2. If the past showed that spiritual blessings came through faith, I argue that the present teaches the same lesson.

that ministereth] 'that supplieth,' R.V. An interesting word, compounded of the root of the word 'chorus.' From meaning 'lead a chorus' it came to mean 'defray the cost of bringing out a chorus,' and hence sometimes 'supply freely and bountifully,' or even 'supply' and 'equip.' The compound used here strengthens the idea of the generosity of the supply. The substantive has the same connotation in Phil. i. 19.

worketh (ii. 8) *miracles*] 'Gr. powers,' R.V. marg. 1 Cor. xii. 10.

among you] not 'in you,' R.V. marg. They saw them. We are told of earlier miracles among the South Galatians at Iconium, Ac. xiv. 3, and Lystra, xiv. 9, 10, where observe '*faith* to be healed.'

6. This verse serves both as an answer to St Paul's question in *v.* 5—yes, it was by faith—and also as a transition to the next important paragraph showing the same truth from Scripture. Marcion omitted *vv.* 6—9 (see Jerome here) in accordance with his opposition to the Old Testament.

Even as **Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness**] From Gen. xv. 6. The Greek is verbally in the LXX. A, D (B non est). In Rom. iv. 3; Jas. ii. 23 there is a very slight verbal difference. In Rom. iv. 9 only the second half is quoted, and this is again used there in *vv.* 22, 23. The Judaizers were doubtless urging the Gentile Christians to be circumcised as Abraham was. St Paul shows, on the contrary, that he, the great forefather of the Jews, obtained his righteousness not by circumcision and works, but by faith. 'The right state of mind is declared to be in God's sight equivalent to the right action' (Mayor on Jas. ii. 23). Observe, however, that in St Paul's usage faith does not take the place of the Law in the sense that it, in itself, is the ground of confidence. On the contrary, faith is only the hand that lays hold on Christ. On the Jewish estimation of Abraham see Sanday-Headlam on Rom. iv. 3—8.

him for righteousness. Know ye therefore that they 7
which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.
And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the 8

7—9. ***Faith makes men sons of Abraham and brings the blessing promised in him.***

(*v.* 7) Ye perceive then that they who draw their spiritual life from faith—these and these only are sons of Abraham. (*v.* 8) But (there is more than sonship, even blessing) the scripture, seeing beforehand that it is of faith that God justifies the Gentiles, gave a gospel message beforehand to Abraham, 'all the Gentiles shall be blessed in thee.' (*v.* 9) So that (as we may conclude) they who draw their spiritual life from faith are blessed (as well as are sons) together with believing Abraham.

7. *Know ye*] Better as R.V. marg. 'ye perceive.' The verb is almost certainly indicative. They could perceive the following truth of the all-importance of faith, and their consequent relation to Abraham, from the preceding argument clinched by *v.* 6.

they which are of faith] Probably this phrase = those who take their start in religion from faith according to the tenor of the preceding verses. Thus it is not the opposite of 'they of the circumcision,' which seems always to mean men of Jewish origin by birth, ii. 12; Ac. x. 45, xi. 2; Rom. iv. 12; Col. iv. 11; and Tit. i. 10†. Its true antitheses are 'they which are of the law,' Rom. iv. 14, cf. 16 (not 'they that are under the law,' *infra* iv. 5; 1 Cor. ix. 20 *bis*, which = observant Jews), and 'as many as are of the works of the law,' *v.* 10†. There is no need to understand 'sons' (Rendall) or 'justified' (Ramsay). Observe that 'they that are through faith' does not occur. St Paul's thought goes deeper than to the means. Faith is the human source, though the Divine means.

the children of Abraham] The Jews claimed spiritual, because physical, relationship, Mt. iii. 9 (‖Luke iii. 8); John viii. 33, 37, 39. Observe the right rendering of the R.V. 'sons,' without even the article before it, for St Paul is insisting on sonship with its full privileges. See Appendix, Note C, for a brief consideration of Ramsay's theory that this passage suggests acquaintance with the Greek (not Roman) law of sonship and inheritance, and so favours the South Galatian theory.

8. *And*] 'The exact force of [the Greek particle *de*] which is never *simply* connective, and never loses *all* shades of its true oppositive character, deserves almost more attentive consideration in these Epp. than any other particle, and will often be found to supply the only true clue to the sequence and evolution of the argument' (Ell.). Here it suggests either (*a*) It is nothing new that the Gentiles should be saved by faith; this was told to Abraham; or, better, (*b*) It is not only a question of sonship but also of blessing.

the scripture] In St John the singular = the particular passage quoted (cf. 'another scripture,' xix. 37), and so generally in St Paul,

heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, *saying*, In thee shall all nations be blessed.
9 So then they which be of faith are blessed with faithful

even in *v.* 22 (see note there). If so, St Paul here meant: 'the particular passage of Scripture which I am about to quote, "foreseeing" etc., preached the Gospel to Abraham beforehand in its words.' But it may be doubted whether here he did not merely translate the common neo-Hebraic *'amar ha-kāthūb*, 'the Scripture saith,' which means the written word generally. He afterwards gives the words in which Scripture thus speaks. 'Every scripture' in 2 Tim. iii. 16 doubtless means every document, rather than every passage short or long.

foreseeing] i.e. before the present time, Ac. ii. 31. It is a common figure of speech to attribute personal activity to Scripture, due ultimately, no doubt, to the sense of the Personality behind it; so here 'foreseeing' and 'preached the gospel beforehand'; *v.* 22, 'shut up,' besides the common 'saith.'

would justify] ii. 16. The verb is strictly present.

the heathen] 'the Gentiles,' R.V. Here first directly stated though implied in ii. 14 end, 16 end. 'Justify the Gentiles' must have been an oxymoron to Jewish readers. Cf. Bengel on 1 Cor. i. 2, 'Ecclesia Dei in Corintho: laetum et ingens paradoxon.'

through faith] The position is emphatic in the original.

preached before the gospel‡] 'The Gospel is older than the law' (Bengel), but St Paul has hardly come to this yet (*v.* 17). 'Beforehand,' R.V., i.e. before the blessing came to the Gentiles, as in 'foreseeing.' Note that for St Paul the Gospel necessarily involves the inclusion of the Gentiles, *v.* 14.

In thee shall all (R.V. adds '**the**') **nations be blessed**] In the Greek 'nations' is the same word as 'heathen'; see also Ac. iii. 25†. The quotation is a fusion of Gen. xii. 3, xviii. 18, cf. xxii. 18. In the Hebrew the verb is probably reflexive, 'shall bless themselves'; in the LXX. and the N.T. passive. The blessing seems to be defined in *vv.* 10 sqq., particularly as freedom from the curse of the Law. But more generally it is that state of friendly and covenant relation to God in which Abraham stood. 'In thee,' in fellowship with Abraham and the truth he represents.

9. *So then*] i.e. since Abraham was justified by faith (*v.* 6), and those who are of faith are his sons (*v.* 7), and the blessings promised to the Gentiles come to them in him (*v.* 8). This thought is fully developed in Rom. iv.

they which be of faith (*v.* 7 note) *are blessed*] The tense is timeless. Observe that 'sons' and 'blessing' are related as 'seed' and 'heirs' in *v.* 29.

with faithful Abraham] i.e. 'with believing Abraham,' or 'with Abraham the believer.' For a full investigation of the use of the Greek word translated 'faithful' see Hort on 1 Pet. i. 21. In both the O.T. and Apocrypha it = 'trustworthy' or 'faithful,' but not 'believing' or

Abraham. For as many as are of the works of the law are 10
under the curse: for it is written, Cursed *is* every one

'trustful.' In the N.T. the latter meaning is still rare, but in our verse it is 'a fresh application of an old epithet of Abraham.' See also in particular 2 Cor. vi. 15; 1 Tim. iv. 3; Ac. xvi. 1. The article recalls the fact that his faith has already been mentioned (*v.* 6), but it must be omitted in English. Similarly 'faithful' no longer means 'full of faith.' Thus the R.V., 'the faithful Abraham,' is doubly unsatisfactory. St Paul changes 'in' to 'with' when uttering his own words, probably because he was accustomed to think of blessing 'in Christ.'

10—14. *Works, regarded as a source of life, bring a curse, faith the blessing and the Spirit.*

(*v.* 10) (It is only faith that brings the blessing) for as many as draw their religious life from works of the Law are actually under a curse. For it stands written 'cursed is every one (however religious) who continueth not in *all* the things that are written in the book of the Law to do them.' (*v.* 11) But (for it is impossible thus to live) that by living in the Law no one is justified before God is evident. Because (as we all know without my saying that it is Scripture), 'He that is just by faith (cf. ii. 16) shall live.' (*v.* 12) But (i.e. this effect is plainly not from the Law, for) the Law has no natural connexion with faith, but (with works, for) 'he that *doeth* them shall live in them.' (*v.* 13) (Is there any hope then for Jews? Yes.) Christ-Messiah redeemed us Jews out of the curse of the Law by becoming a curse (i.e. entering into our state of 'cursed,' *v.* 10, so far as even to come expressly under the curse described in the Law) for our sakes, because it stands written, 'Cursed is every one who hangeth on a piece of wood.' (*v.* 14) The object of His redeeming Jews was that, redemption being accomplished in their case, then the blessing of (with and in) Abraham might extend as far as the Gentiles, (taking place) in Jesus Christ; in order that (by the reception of this blessing) we (all) may receive the promise of the Spirit by means of (not our works but) our faith.

10. So far is it from all nations sharing with Abraham in blessing by the deeds of the Law, that they themselves who are under the Law are under a curse. Thus to obtain the blessing through the Law is impossible to human nature (see Theodore).

For as many as (*v.* 27, vi. 12, 16; Rom. ii. 12 *bis*) *are of the works of the law*] More emphatic and, as it were, inclusive than 'they who are of the works of the law.' It includes, at first sight, all Jews and such Gentiles as accepted the Law as a means of salvation. Yet both phrases are able to exclude those, whether Jews or Gentiles, who, though living under the Law, were not of it, but had faith like that of Abraham. 'Works of the law,' ii. 16 note.

are] Observe its emphatic repetition.

under the ('a,' R.V.) *curse*] 'Curse' elsewhere in St Paul's Epp., *v.* 13 *bis*†. It implies separation and departure from God, Mt. xxv. 41. In Dt. xi. 26—28 'the blessings' and 'the curse' are contrasted.

that continueth not in all *things* which are written
11 in the book of the law to do them. But that no *man* is
justified by the law in the sight of God, *it is* evident: for,
12 The just shall live by faith. And the law is not of

for it is written, etc.] From Dt. xxvii. 26, LXX. The only important difference is the insertion of 'in the book.' The slight differences from the Hebrew are noticed under the separate words. It is the closing verse of the curses to be pronounced on Ebal. 'Requiritur obedientia perfecta, *in omnibus*, et perpetua, *permanet*. Hanc nemo praestat' (Bengel). On the burden of the Law and St Paul's attitude to it see ii. 16 note.

Cursed†] *v.* 13. The Greek word is frequent in LXX., and found also in the Inscriptions (Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, pp. 61, 219; E. T. pp. 93 sq., 305).

every one] Not in the Hebrew, but a fair expansion of its meaning. Jerome thinks that it was there originally.

that continueth not] The same Greek word is used in Ac. xiv. 22; Heb. viii. 9; and of abiding in a place, Ac. xxviii. 30†. The Hebrew has 'confirmeth not.'

in all things **which are written**] Heb. 'the words'; LXX. 'all the words.'

in the book] Not in Heb. or LXX. The word means properly the papyrus-roll ('Byblos' is probably only another form of 'Papyros'), but later, in both its ordinary (*biblos*) and its diminutive (*biblion*) forms, may mean a book of the ordinary shape. On the subject see Kenyon in Hastings, *D. B.* IV. 945 sqq. St Paul seems purposely to have employed words which would exclude the Oral Law.

to do them] More than merely epexegetic. It marks the aim of the continuance in the things written etc.; cf. Rom. vi. 6; Phil. iii. 10.

11. *But*] Adversative to the possibility of continuing in the things of the Law. The opposite is shown by the existence of another source of justification and consequent life, stated in Habakkuk.

by (better 'in') *the law*] The Jewish Law, as throughout this Epistle; see ii. 16 note. The phrase is to be taken closely with 'is justified,' and signifies in the performance of the Law, not, as it is often misunderstood, in the statement of the Law, i.e. the Prophets. It takes the place of 'from the works of the law.'

in the sight of God] Cf. Rom. ii. 13.

it is *evident*] With the preceding. Some join it with the following, replacing 'for' ('because') by 'that,' 'Now because no one (as is evident from *v.* 10) is justified in (the) Law it is clear that the righteous shall live by faith.' But this form of reasoning is very un-Pauline.

for] Proof: Faith (not works) justifies, and life ensues.

The just shall live by (literally 'of') **faith**] So Rom. i. 17. See also Heb. x. 38. From Hab. ii. 4, where it is said that, in contrast

faith: but, The man that doeth them shall live in them. Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, 13
being made a curse for us: for it is written, Cursed *is*

to the Chaldaean invader whose soul is lifted up in pride, the righteous (though hemmed in by the wicked, i. 4) shall live by his steadfastness, i.e. primarily his trustworthiness and faithfulness of principle. This, as the result of steady faith, is not unfairly understood as faith in the active sense by the N.T. writers, though probably not by the LXX. (see Driver, *Minor Prophets*, p. 63). The LXX. misreading 'his' as 'my' has in B 'but the just shall live by my faith' (or 'faith in me'), which A modifies, reading 'my just one.'

It is very difficult to decide whether St Paul intended the stress of 'by faith' to lie on 'the just' or on 'shall live.' In favour of the latter is the almost certain construction of the Hebrew and of the quotation in Hebrews, and the ease with which St Paul could have modified the quotation to run 'He who is just by faith.' Yet the former is preferable here in view of the fact that up to this point he has been thinking of justification, and not of life (see especially Winer-Schmiedel, § 20. 5 *d*). How can men escape the curse (*v.* 10), and be righteous? By faith.

12. *And* ('but') *the law*] In contrast to the effect of faith just mentioned.

is not of faith] The Law has not faith as the fundamental principle, or basis, of its existence. The phrase is even stronger than Theodoret's words imply: 'The Law does not look for faith, but demands action, and to those that keep it promises life.'

but, **The man that doeth them shall live in them**] From Lev. xviii. 5, a free rendering of the Hebrew; see also Ezek. xx. 11. St Paul has the same quotation in Rom. x. 5, in a slightly different form. The promise in Leviticus and Ezekiel is that in performance lies life. But what if, as is the case, performance is more than we can accomplish? We must find our refuge in God Himself, i.e. leave the Law for Faith.

13. *Christ*] The absence of a connecting particle emphasizes the greatness of this glad contrast (Col. ii. 20 note). Cf. Tit. iii. 4—7. Probably 'Christ' here has its full meaning of 'Messiah,' if, as it seems, St Paul is thinking of Jews.

hath redeemed] The R.V. rightly omits 'hath.' See also iv. 5 note.

us] This also by its position has a secondary emphasis. He means 'us Jews' (he thinks of Gentiles in *v.* 14, as in iv. 5) who as being 'from the works of the Law' were under a curse (*v.* 10).

from (literally 'out of') *the curse of the law*] The preposition lays stress on the fact that we were in the curse.

being made ('by becoming') *a curse for us*] We should not have dared to apply such a term to Christ, and our tendency still is to minimize its meaning. But while we must be careful not to extend this unduly we cannot exaggerate its intensity. Christ did know in

14 every one that hangeth on a tree: that the blessing of

awful reality the effect of sin in separating from God (Mt. xxvii. 46). Elsewhere St Paul says that He was made 'sin' (2 Cor. v. 21). He became an awful example of the inexorable rigour of the Law.

'For' (*hyper*), i.e. 'on behalf of,' not 'instead of' (*anti*), though Christ Himself says that He came to give His life a ransom 'for (*anti* 'instead of') many' (Mark x. 45 ‖ Mt. xx. 28). Thus St Paul avoids here the question, so dear to Protestant controversialists, of the manner in which the redemption acted. 'Instead of us' would more readily have suggested (though it would not have required) the meaning that He bore the exact equivalent of the punishment due to sinners. 'A curse for our sake' is vaguer, and perhaps more suitable to our limited intelligence of the stupendous self-sacrifice on the cross.

Chrysostom draws out the meaning of the Apostles' language when he writes: 'Even as if, when a man is condemned to die, another who is innocent chooses to die on behalf of him, he rescues him from the punishment. Thus also did Christ.'

On the possibility, however, that *hyper* may contain some thought of 'instead of' see note at Phm. 13, with its illustration from the papyri, and Ell. here, also i. 4, ii. 20 notes, and Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, pp. 105, 239, 242; E. T. pp. 153, 335, 339. Meyer says that this does not lie in the preposition but in the circumstances of the case. See further A. T. Robertson, *Short Grammar*, p. 124.

for (proof that 'a curse' is a right description) *it is written*, **Cursed** (*v.* 10) **is every one that hangeth** *on a tree*] From the LXX. of Dt. xxi. 23, which however has 'by God' after 'cursed' in accordance with the Hebrew. The curse must have been in fact 'by God' for it to have been of any validity, but St Paul naturally shrinks from saying so. Of course Deut. xxi. 23 does not refer to crucifixion or impaling alive, but to the hanging or impaling of a dead body (Josh. x. 26; 2 Sam. iv. 12) as an additional disgrace. St Paul, however, does not quote the passage to illustrate the mode of death, but the place on which a person hangs.

The above rendering of the Hebrew (lit. 'he that is hanged is a curse of God') is essentially also that of Aquila and Theodotion, and is doubtless right, but it is possible for the Hebrew to mean 'is a curse, i.e. an insult, to God.' So many Jewish authorities. Rashi, for example, says 'It is a slight to the King, because man is made in the likeness of His image.' See further Lightfoot's additional note, p. 150, and Driver on Deut.

on a tree] So Ac. v. 30, x. 39, xiii. 29; 1 Pet. ii. 24.

Elsewhere in the N.T., with the exception of its use in the phrase 'the tree of life,' the Greek word always means dead wood. And so probably here, in accordance with Jewish law for a gibbet (see *Jewish Encyclopedia*, III. 557).

14. *that*] The redemption of the Jews was in order that the blessing of and in Abraham might also come on the Gentiles. For if

Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through

Jews, Abraham's seed, remained under the curse Gentiles could not be delivered.

There is no thought in the context of the destruction of the Law as a *barrier* between Jew and Gentile (Eph. ii. 14); nor even of the fact that Jews, and therefore Gentiles, were set free from the *dominion* of the Law (or they would have gone back again into the curse).

the blessing] Vaughan on Rom. xv. 29 well summarizes the use of this term (*eulogia*). (*a*) Speaking good of another, especially as applied to the praise of God, Jas. iii. 10; Rev. vii. 12. (*b*) A benediction which fulfils itself in benefaction, either on the part of man, 2 Cor. ix. 5, or on that of God, Rom. xv. 29; Eph. i. 3, and here.

of Abraham] He was blessed and others were to be blessed with him (*v.* 9) and in him (*v.* 8).

might come on the Gentiles] 'might reach unto the Gentiles.' The dative would have been sufficient to say that the Gentiles got the blessing, Ac. ii. 43. The stronger form probably suggests more difficulty in the process, or distance in the recipients. But the fact that 'in modern Greek *eis* is the usual circumlocution for the lost dative' (Blass, *Gram.* § 39. 5) makes it possible that it is only a more vivid, and more emphatic, way of expressing transference. There seems to be no exact parallel to the usage here. The nearest is 2 Cor. viii. 14. Contrast 1 Cor. xv. 45.

through ('in,' R.V.) *Jesus Christ*] Added to concentrate St Paul's teaching. The order suggests first the historic Personality who suffered and rose, and secondly His eternal relation to believers.

that...] The reception of the promise of the Spirit is closely connected with the inclusion of the Gentiles (*v.* 8 note), and here made dependent upon it logically.

we might receive] St Paul reverts to *v.* 2. But here, as often, St Paul hastens to identify himself with those to whom he writes. It means 'we all,' Jewish and Gentile believers.

the promise] The first use of a word that is very important in the following verses. It appears to have been already a technical term in Pharisaic circles for the privileges possessed by the true Israelite (see Hart, *Ecclesiasticus*, pp. 306 sqq.). St Paul here further defines it, and, in defining, raises it to a higher level.

of the Spirit] The Spirit was definitely promised in Joel ii. 28; cf. Ac. ii. 16 sqq. Here it is implied that the promise had run all through Israel's history. In a sense this is true, for Moses' words, Num. xi. 26—29, imply the possibility of all the LORD's people being prophets, with the LORD's Spirit upon them.

through faith] Better, 'by means of our faith.' Theodore, regarding the resurrection-life as already begun, is very good in his remarks on there being no place now left for the Law. 'Superfluum et quidem ultra est; redditum est ei debitum a Christo, quod a nobis

15 faith. Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though

debebatur. Locum autem non habens, quoniam res non admittit eos qui semel transmigraverunt in futuram vitam praesentis vitae succumbere negotiis.'

15—18. *The relation of the promise to the Law; the latter cannot hinder the former.*

'Having shown that faith is older than the Law, he teaches again that the Law cannot become a hindrance to the divine promises' (Theodoret).

(*v.* 15) Brethren, I use human imagery—terms understood by all—and though they come short of the reality I say even a man's disposition of his goods when confirmed no one else sets aside or adds to. (*v.* 16) But (for I turn to higher things) to Abraham the many promises were solemnly spoken and to his seed. Yet notice how the very form of the word 'seed' points to other than the individual descendants. It sums up all in one Person, even Christ. (*v.* 17) I mean this by the figure of speech employed in *v.* 15: a Disposition confirmed long since by God the Law that has come into existence 430 years afterwards cannot annul, so as to make the promise inoperative. (*v.* 18) For (Law and Promise being incompatible) if the inheritance is from the Law it is no more of promise. But in fact to Abraham God has given the inheritance by promise, and the gift stands, a gift of God.

15. *Brethren*] i. 11 note. 'Receive' (*v.* 14) has suggested a common relationship to Christ.

I speak after the manner of men] In i. 11 the same Greek phrase is translated 'after man.' Rom. iii. 5† guides us to the right meaning here: I am applying human arguments as though I were speaking of the relation of man to man, although I am well aware that the reality deals with the relation of God to us. A less probable interpretation based on 1 Cor. ix. 8 is: I take an illustration from ordinary human life, in contrast to one taken from Scripture. So Chrysostom.

Though it be *but a man's covenant*] In Greek *diatheké*. It is extremely difficult to determine the meaning of this term here and in *v.* 17 and the image intended by St Paul.

(1) The Greek word that appears to us to be the most natural translation of 'covenant' (i.e. a contract or agreement between two parties) is *suntheké*, which is common from Aeschylus downwards (see L. and S.). *Diatheké* on the contrary seems never to mean a covenant in Classical Greek (see the criticism of Lightfoot by Ramsay, *Gal.* p. 362) or in the Greek of the Papyri and Inscriptions. Deissmann writes, 'There is ample material to back me in the statement that no one in the Mediterranean world in the first century A.D. would have thought of finding in the word *diatheké* the idea of "covenant[1]."' In

[1] 'Ich kann auf Grund eines grossen Materials wohl sagen, dass kein Mensch in der Mittelmeerwelt des ersten Jahrhunderts nach Christus auf den Gedanken kommen konnte, in dem Worte διαθήκη den Begriff *Bund* zu finden' (*Licht vom Osten*, p. 243; E. T. p. 341).

it be but a man's [1]covenant, *yet if it be* confirmed, no *man*

[1] Or, *testament.*

these two vast collections of Greek it means a solemn enactment or disposition of property etc., to take effect either in lifetime or after death.

(2) Yet it is, as we may say, the only rendering of *b^erith*, 'covenant,' in the LXX. For, if we take Hatch and Redpath's Concordance as the basis, we find that *b^erith* is represented by *diatheké* 282 times, by *suntheké* only once, in 2 Kings xvii. 15 A, and by *entolai* once in 1 Kings xi. 11. It is also transliterated three times.

How are we to account for this use of *diatheké* by the LXX. in face of the evidence of the classics and the Inscriptions and Papyri? We notice that in Gen. vi. 18, the first occurrence of *b^erith*, it is used of God's promise to Noah, and obviously therefore *diatheké* is a more suitable translation than *suntheké*. If this did not actually set the tone for the use of *diatheké* rather than *suntheké* (even in cases where *b^erith* means a covenant between man and man) throughout the O.T. (and we cannot suppose this in view of the multitude of translators) yet it fell in with what must have been the current note in the Graeco-Jewish mind of the time. Hence when used of God *diatheké* would retain much of its proper meaning, a solemn disposition; the additional notion of acceptance, and so agreement by the receiving party, being wholly subordinate. So especially Jer. xxxi. 31, the new covenant of the Prophets. It may perhaps be added that it is also possible that the *dia* of the compounds *diatheké* and its corresponding verb, though properly meaning thoroughness, may, by a popular etymology, have suggested to a Jew *passing through* the divided members of the animal connected with a covenant.

(3) The use of *diatheké* in the N.T.

(i) In no instance is it, or its verb, indisputably used of a mere contract between man and man. (ii) The quotations from the O.T., or the allusions to it, in every case refer to a Divine *diatheké*. (*a*) With Abraham and the Fathers, Lk. i. 72; Ac. iii. 25, vii. 8; Rom. ix. 4 (plural); Eph. ii. 12 (plural). (*b*) In the time of Moses, Heb. viii. 9 (*vide infra*); Heb. ix. 4 *bis*, 15 *b* ('the first *diatheké*'), 20 and apparently Rev. xi. 19. (*c*) The new covenant of the Prophets, Rom. xi. 27, taken from Isa. lix. 20, 21; Heb. viii. 8—10 (from Jer. xxxi. 31 sqq.), x. 16. To this perhaps may be added viii. 6 and ix. 15 *a*. (iii) The reference by our Lord at the Last Supper (Mk. xiv. 24, 'This is my blood of the *diatheké*, which is shed for many' ‖ Mt. xxvi. 28; Lk. xxii. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 25) is to a *diatheké* by God in the O.T. sense, i.e. a disposition by God, though the mention of blood seems to contain the connotation of acceptance by God's people. (iv) The language of the writer of Heb. ix. 16, 17 looks indeed at first sight as though the author used *diatheké* in the sense of 'will' or 'testament,' i.e. a disposition to take effect only at death; but probably even there the thought of 'the death of the testator' is connected with the death of Christ rather as 'covenant-

victim' than as testator properly so called (see Westcott *in loco* and especially p. 302). See also vii. 22, x. 29, xii. 24, xiii. 20.

(4) St Paul in the passages already cited and also in 2 Cor. iii. 6 ('*a new diatheké*') and 14 ('the old *diatheké*'), Eph. ii. 12, uses the word *diatheké* in the sense in which the translators of the LXX. used it with reference to God, and in which our Lord used it in the words recorded of Him, and there seems to be no reason to doubt that he used it in the same sense in our Epistle. But there is almost equally little doubt that the word 'covenant' does not adequately express this sense. Some such word as 'disposition' is required if we are to bring out the supremacy and the grace connoted by *diatheké*. We may not translate 'will' or 'testament,' for these connote death, which *diatheké* does not necessarily do. It may, for example, include an adoption of a son during lifetime (see Ramsay, *Gal.* p. 351). Our 'deed of gift' is perhaps the closest legal term representative of *diatheké*; cf. Philo's words on p. 55 *infra*. In iii. 15 St Paul is thinking of a 'disposition' by man generally; in *v.* 17 he passes directly to the great 'disposition' made by God which governs all His dealings with Abraham and his descendants. In iv. 24 he has in his mind the two 'dispositions' by God, one made on Mount Sinai, the other made through Christ.

(5) Observe further:

(*a*) The subject is quite general. There is no reference either to the Roman or to the Greek law of wills, if even a difference of custom existed *at this time*. See Appendix, Note C. In particular observe that there is no reference to adoption in these verses.

It may even be questioned whether 'the inheritance' (*v.* 18) is regarded as the result of the 'disposition'; for it is so very common a metaphor in the Old Testament.

(*b*) If in our verse the reference is quite general there is no occasion to ask how the question of death comes in. A 'disposition' may or may not depend on the death of the testator. Thus in the reality of which the human 'disposition' is a figure there is no room for objecting that God does not die, or for answering with Luther that the death of the Lord Jesus meets the difficulty. The question of death is simply not raised by St Paul, and the object of a commentary is to try to understand his thoughts, not to discuss what he never intended to suggest.

yet] 'nevertheless,' i.e. although it seems indecorous to apply human arguments to God's procedure—even a man's *diatheké* no one treats lightly.

if it be ('when it hath been,' R.V.) *confirmed*] 2 Cor. ii. 8; Gen. xxiii. 20 (of the field and the cave to Abraham). Purposely nothing is said about the manner of ratification. All is as general as possible.

no man] i.e. no person other than the 'disposer.' To understand it as meaning no person, no, not even the 'disposer' himself, is to put an intolerable strain upon the passage. In our passage it excludes 'the law' of *v.* 17, personifying it.

disannulleth, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his 16
seed were the promises made. *He* saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is

disannulleth] 'maketh it void,' R.V. 'Sets aside,' ii. 21 note on 'frustrate.'

or addeth thereto‡] i.e. adds a fresh clause, a codicil, or a later deed. Cf. Joseph. *B. J.* II. 2. 3 (§ 20) of Antipas, and, for the contrary opinion of Archelaus and his advocate, 6 (§ 35), who 'deemed that the original testament was more valid than the later one.' The statement is general, but as referring to God's action it is implied that the Law is not an addition to the promise in the sense that it affects the latter.

16. The verse shows (*a*) the antiquity of the *diatheké*; it was given to Abraham: (*b*) its character; it consisted of promises: (*c*) the truths underlying its form; (*α*) it was not limited to Abraham personally but extended to his seed; (*β*) and in fact the word 'seed' strictly interpreted indicated a reference to one Person, i.e. Christ.

and his seed] The *diatheké* was not limited to Abraham's own life. It extends to his descendants. St Paul does not here discuss who these are, partly because he has already shown that they who are of faith are his sons in the truest sense, *v.* 7, but chiefly because the words suggest to him another thought that is even further-reaching.

the promises] Plural, because the one promise was often repeated, Gen. xii. 7, xiii. 15, 17, xvii. 7—10, xxii. 18, xxiv. 7. Of these Gen. xvii. 7—10 seems to be most in St Paul's mind because the word *diatheké* occurs there.

He *saith not*] Better, 'It saith not,' i.e. Scripture. So also Rom. xv. 10 (where it serves as a change of expression from 'is written'); Eph. iv. 8 and perhaps even v. 14.

And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, **And to thy seed**] The plural 'seeds.' The plural is used of persons in Dan. xi. 31 (Theodotion), where it is a harsh rendering of a wrongly vocalized Hebrew term (*zerō'im* as though *zerā'im*). In 4 Mac. xviii. 1 ('Oh children of Israel, descendants of the Abrahamic seeds') the plural seems to regard Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as so many 'Abrahamic seeds.' Plato, *Laws*, p. 853 C, is also quoted. But, practically speaking, the plural either of the Greek or of the Hebrew word could not be used of human progeny. The Apostle knew this, and *more Rabbinico* calls attention to the fact that a word was chosen which (whether perforce or not makes no difference) was in fact employed in the singular. There is, he says, a spiritual meaning in this: all Abraham's descendants are summed up in one, I say one Person, even Christ.

Precisely similar in principle to St Paul's words is the reverse argument of the force of the plural *dᵉmey* (bloods) instead of the singular *dām* (blood) in Gen. iv. 10. This means, it is said, Abel's own blood and the blood of his descendants; or that Abel's blood was cast on the trees and on the stones (Mishna, *Sanhedrin* IV. 5 = T. B. *Sanhedr.* 37ᵃ). Even more similar is the insistence on the singular *rish'a* ('wickedness')

17 Christ. And this I say, *that* the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul, that *it*

in Deut. xxv. 2 instead of the impossible plural *r'sha'ôth* ('wickednesses'), T. B. *K'thuboth*, 37a. (These references are due to Surenhusius, *Biblos Catallages*, pp. 85 sq.). It may also be worth mentioning that 'seed' in Gen. iv. 25 is said to refer to Messiah in *B'reshith R.*, Parasha XXIII. 7, and in Gen. xix. 32 in *B'reshith R.*, Parasha LI. 10, while the Targum of Isa. liii. 10 renders 'he shall see (his) seed' by 'they shall see the kingdom of their Messiah.' Observe particularly that Christ is mentioned here not as He through whom the blessing is obtained, but as He *to* whom the promise was given, i.e. He is regarded as the recipient of the promise. If so it is evident that others, whether Jews or Gentiles, can receive it only in Him. They who are 'of works' and not 'of faith' on Christ lose all share in the promise.

17. *And* ('Now,' R.V.) *this I say*] Now what I mean, by using the figure in *v.* 15.

covenant] St Paul here distinctly passes from the general notion of *diatheké* (*v.* 15 note) to the special, i.e. to God's great disposition to Abraham.

confirmed before‡] The preposition strengthens the thought of time already lying in the perfect. The confirmation may be seen in the vision of the burning lamp (Gen. xv.), or the repetition of the promise, or the oath (Heb. vi. 13, 14 referring to Gen. xxii. 16, 17).

in Christ] To be omitted with the best MSS.

the law, which was ('came,' R.V.) *four hundred and thirty years after*] St Paul is not concerned with the question as to who gave the Law, or with that of its being 'given' at all, but only with the fact of its having come into existence.

St Paul's period of 430 years from Abraham to the exodus is that of the LXX. in Ex. xii. 40 sq. ('now the sojourning of the children of Israel, which they sojourned in the land of Egypt and in the land of Canaan was four hundred and thirty years,' only the original hand of B the Vatican MS. reads 'thirty-five'), which is also that of the Samaritan Pentateuch, Josephus, *Ant.* II. 15. 2 (§ 318), Jerusalem Targum on Ex. xii. 40 (the Fragmenten-targum does not contain this verse). Compare also Charles' note on the Book of Jubilees xiv. 13. But St Stephen, Ac. vii. 6 (though using '400' as a round number), follows the Hebrew of Ex. xii. 40, according to which the 430 years were all spent in Egypt, and so Philo (*Quis rer. div. her.* 54, § 269) and Josephus (*Ant.* II. 9. 1 [§ 204]; *B.J.* v. 9. 4 [§ 382]). So also Gen. xv. 13.

cannot ('doth not,' R.V.) *disannul*] i.e. 'does not repeal,' Matt. xv. 6‖ Mark vii. 13†; stronger than the term used in *v.* 15. See Swete on Mark vii. 13. Cf. the juristic formula in the papyri (Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 228, and Moulton and Milligan in *Expositor*, VII. 5, 1908, p. 177).

should make the promise of none effect. For if the inheri- 18
tance *be* of the law, *it is* no more of promise: but God gave *it* to Abraham by promise.

that it *should* ('so as to,' R.V.) *make the promise of none effect*] See the note on v. 4. Compare Rom. iv. 14.

18. *For if*] I say 'make...of none effect,' *for* the Law and the promise are so fundamentally different in their nature that if the inheritance promised in the Disposition after all springs from the Law (or perhaps 'from law'), it no longer springs from promise. The absence of the article before 'promise' (contrast *v.* 17), i.e. promise as such, probably determines *in this verse* the meaning of 'law,' i.e. law as such.

the inheritance] While we must keep 'inheritance' as a translation (rather than any such word as 'apportionment') because of its connexion with 'heirs,' *v.* 29, iv. 1, 7, it must be remembered that according to Hort (see his important note on 1 Pet. i. 4) it 'apparently contains no implication of hereditary succession, as it does usually in classical Greek. The sense is rather "sanctioned and settled possession."' The 'inheritance' of Israel was originally the land of Canaan, as is implied in Gen. xii. 7, xiii. 15, 17, xvii. 8, xxiv. 7, but the word readily lent itself to include, as here, all spiritual privileges present and future, which are 'the fulfilment of ancient longings of men and ancient promises of God.' See also Westcott, *Hebrews*, pp. 167 sqq.

but God gave ('hath granted,' R.V.) it *to Abraham by promise*] 'Gott aber hat's Abraham durch Verheissung frei geschenkt' (Luther). The fact is certain. It was by promise, not law.

Also God not only promised the inheritance, but He has given it freely by promise and the gift abides. St Paul's fresh word emphasizes the freeness of the gift and the tense its permanence. So Ac. xxvii. 24; Rom. viii. 32; Phm. 22. The fact that God's disposition has been given once for all by promise forbids any essential alteration of it. 'A *diatheké*,' says Philo, 'is a symbol of grace, which God has placed between Himself who proffers it and man who receives it; and this is the very extravagance of beneficence, that there is nothing between God and the soul except his own virgin grace' (*De Mut. Nom.* 6, §§ 52 sq., Young's translation).

19—22. *The true place and purpose of the Law. It was subordinate to the promise, and preparatory, by developing the sense of sin.*

(*v.* 19) (If the inheritance is by the promise, not by the Law) What in that case is the essential character of the Law? It was added for the sake of the transgressions of it (i.e. it was to show the tendency of human nature), and was to last only until the Seed (Christ) should come, to whom (as we saw) the promise has been made, being appointed (on God's side) by the means of angels and (on man's side) received in the hands of a mediator (Moses). (*v.* 20) But (so far from a mediator being a good thing) a mediator suggests a lack of unity, while God is Unity itself. What requires a mediator therefore does not wholly correspond

19 Wherefore then *serveth* the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made; *and it was* ordained by angels in the

to God's nature. (*v.* 21) Is the Law therefore against the many promises that God has given? God forbid (this would imply a contradiction in God Himself). As law nothing can be better, for if a law had ever been given which could have made men live, righteousness would indeed have been in the Law. (*v.* 22) But (so far is it from bringing righteousness that) the scripture in the passage already quoted enclosed all the results of the Law under sin, in order that the promise to Abraham should, as a result of faith in Jesus Christ, be given to those who have faith, the Law thus ultimately not being opposed to the promises, but actually securing their fulfilment.

19. *Wherefore then* serveth *the law?*] If the Law does not modify the disposition, i.e. the promise, what therefore is its essential character and aim? For we may assume that it was not given superfluously, or as Luther puts it: 'When we teach that a man is justified without the Law and works, then doth this question necessarily follow: If the Law do not justify, why was it given?'

It was added because of transgressions] 'Transgressions,' Rom. ii. 23, iv. 15, v. 14; 1 Tim. ii. 14; Heb. ii. 2, ix. 15†. 'Transgressor,' ii. 18. The article is probably possessive, i.e. 'the transgressions of it.'

The clause is patient of two interpretations:

(*a*) The transgressions of the promise made the Law necessary lest the promise should be lost. God gave the Law in order that the promise might be maintained.

(*b*) The Law was added to bring out before the conscience the transgressions of itself, to show the tendency of human nature as a dam shows the force of the stream. This is to be preferred as being certainly the meaning of the kindred passages, Rom. iv. 13—15, v. 20, vii. 7—12 and as virtually stated in *v.* 22 *infra*. Perhaps St Paul had already dwelt upon this in his oral teaching, for he assumes that his meaning will be intelligible to his readers. Here it was sufficient to indicate the cause of this temporary addition to the promise, which he says the Law was.

till the seed] Christ as already defined in *v.* 16.

should come] Cf. Gen. xlix. 10, especially the Latin renderings there for Shiloh: 'semen quod ei repositum est' (Tractatus de sanctis scripturis), and 'semen cui repositum est' (Hilary).

Luther points out that St Paul's statement is true both literally, i.e. the Law lasted only until Christ came, and spiritually, i.e. in the individual the Law does not reign in the conscience after Christ is admitted.

to whom the promise was made] Better, 'to whom He has made the promise.'

and it was *ordained, etc.*] The clause is added to show the inferiority of the Law to the promise. The promise was given directly by God

hand of a mediator. Now a mediator is not *a mediator* of 20

to Abraham; the Law was given indirectly, and indeed doubly so, (*a*) by means of angels, (*b*) through Moses.

Another reason for the addition of the clause has been found. It enhances in the mind of the reader the dignity of the Law and the solemnity of its ordination, as though 'the glory of the Law glorified the glory of the promise.' But St Paul is here rather belittling the Law than magnifying the promise, and he is about to point out the inferiority of a mediator.

'Ordained,' 'appointed' as in 1 Cor. vii. 17, xvi. 1. In Inscriptions found in Asia Minor the Greek word is technically used of making testamentary dispositions (Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 57; E. T. p. 87) and so probably here. The tense is synchronous with 'was added.' Ramsay (*Gal.* p. 381) strangely thinks that it marks a further step after that term.

by ('through,' R.V.) *angels*] The earliest mention of angels as the *media* through whom the Law was given to Moses appears to be *Jubilees*, i. 27 (where see Charles): 'and He said to the angel of the presence [perhaps Michael]: "Write for Moses from the beginning of creation till My sanctuary has been built among them for all eternity."' Compare Josephus, *Ant.* xv. 5. 3 (§ 136), 'But we learned the finest of our doctrines and the holiest things contained in our laws from God by means of angels.' So also Ac. vii. 53; Heb. ii. 2. The mention of angels in Dt. xxxiii. 2 in connexion with the giving of the Law, especially in the LXX. where they are said to have been on the right hand of the LORD, marks an earlier stage in the doctrine. Luther expresses the thought of our passage when he writes, 'The Law is the voice of the servants, but the Gospel is the voice of the Lord Himself.'

in ('by,' R.V.) *the hand*] Hardly the common Hebraism ('by the hand of' = 'by') employed to avoid the repetition of 'through.' It suggests the reception by Moses of the tables into his hands.

of a mediator] *v.* 20; 1 Tim. ii. 5; Heb. viii. 6, ix. 15, xii. 24; Job ix. 33†: cf. 'interposed' ('mediated,' R.V. marg.), Heb. vi. 17‡. In *Test. XII. Patr.*, Dan. 6 the angel that intercedes for Israel is called 'the mediator between God and men,' but in our Epistle the word evidently refers to Moses, as in the *Assumption of Moses*, i. 14, iii. 12. St Paul, that is to say, regards the angels as *media*, not as mediators; as taking no active part in praying or proclaiming. Thus a second medium is employed between God and Israel, first angels as representing God, and then Moses as representing the people (cf. Dt. v. 5).

20. *Now a mediator*] The Greek article 'the' is generic, or, perhaps better, recalls the mediator just mentioned: cf. *vv.* 23, 25.

'Now' strictly adversative, probably to the thought that a mediator is in itself good, or possibly to the Jewish glorification of Moses as mediator.

is not a mediator *of one*] rather does not belong to the category of 'one.' In a promise God acts alone; when a mediator is employed in

21 one, but God is one. *Is* the law then against the promises of God? God forbid: for if there had been a law given

any act of His there is an implication of plurality and separation from Himself so long as the thing mediated is in force.

but God is one] But God is essentially one in His nature and character. The idea of unity in word and act is most consonant with Him. The Greek word for 'one' is in the masculine. St Paul would doubtless have employed the neuter if this would not have suggested to his readers too material and impersonal a thought to be connected with God.

The verse thus serves to bring out the superiority of the promise over the Law. It is in fuller agreement with God's own character than was the Law. For the promise was given directly by God to Abraham and his seed: the Law was given mediately, through angels and by Moses. This mediation is a mark of inferiority set upon it.

The verse is so difficult that it is said to have received above 250 (Meyer) or 430 (Jowett) interpretations. The most important source of differences lies in the second half, many expositors explaining it as 'God is one party and the Israelites are a second,' i.e. the Law depends for its fulfilment upon the ability of the second party to keep it, and is in this respect inferior to the unconditioned character of the Promise. But though at first sight the masculine suggests this interpretation, yet this is not so closely connected with the immediate context as that given above.

Observe (1) St Paul's purpose in this verse is not to state, much less to prove, monotheism. He assumes this, and does not even mention it save in so far as it is included under the unity of God's nature. (2) *vv.* 19, 20 are not opposed to the Christian doctrine of the mediatorship of Christ. St Paul would thoroughly agree with the ordinary Jewish view that a mediatorship in the sense of an intermediate being between God and man is unnecessary. Nay, he says here as much, for, though a believer in Christ, he speaks disparagingly of such a mediator. The fact is that to him, as to us, Christ is not distinct from God, but is God. When on the other hand he speaks of '(the) man Christ Jesus' as 'mediator between God and men' (1 Tim. ii. 5) he is regarding Him in His humanity, putting, for the moment, His Godhead out of sight. See the quotation from a letter by Archbishop Temple, Appendix, Note D.

21. Is *the law then*] Seeing therefore that the Law is inferior to the Promise (*vv.* 19, 20) are we to conclude that there is opposition between these two expressions of God's mind? Is, that is to say, the Law by its very nature contradictory to the Promises?

against the promises (*v.* 16) *of God?*] The last two words are omitted in B the Vatican MS.

God forbid] St Paul is so horrified because it would imply a contradiction in the mind and character of God.

for if, etc.] No, *for* the Law as far as it goes is good.

which could have given life, verily righteousness should have been by the law. But the scripture hath concluded all 22
under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be

verily] Better, 'in reality,' as opposed to mere pretence. The Greek word is found only here, 1 Cor. xiv. 25; 1 Tim. v. 3, 5, 16, vi. 19, in St Paul's writings.

righteousness should have been] In the Greek 'the' precedes 'righteousness.' This article is difficult. Either it means the righteousness required, and even revealed, in the Law but not obtained in it, or, and more probably, it consciously takes up the thought of the righteousness suggested in *v.* 11. In either case it is the necessary condition of the life implied in the preceding clause. See Addenda, p. xii.

by (better, 'in') *the law*] Almost certainly (*a*) 'in the Law' (ii. 16 note on 'the works of the law'). The Mosaic Law would have brought righteousness. But possibly (*b*) 'in law' as such. The Mosaic Law was a failure because righteousness is not to be found in law at all, but in faith. The reading 'of,' found in the majority of authorities, but not in the Vatican MS., is in favour of (*b*). There does not seem to be sufficient reason for taking the preposition translated 'in' as instrumental.

22. *But*] In contradiction to the hypothesis in *v.* 21 *b*, the statement of Scripture is otherwise.

the scripture] *v.* 8 note. The passage here referred to is Deut. xxvii. 26, quoted in *v.* 10, or, less probably, Ps. cxlii. (cxliii.) 2, quoted in ii. 16.

hath concluded] 'hath shut up,' R.V. *v.* 23; Rom. xi. 32; Lk. v. 6. For the metaphorical use of the verb in the LXX. see Pss. xxx. (xxxi.) 9, lxxvii. (lxxviii.) 50, 62. The preposition of the compound refers not to the things enclosed, i.e. 'together,' but to the completeness of the closure, 'complete custody, so that the enclosed are absolutely and entirely held in by the barriers in question' (Meyer).

all] 'all things,' R.V. Not in the fullest sense of the phrase as in Col. i. 20. Perhaps it is safest to understand it of the whole results of the dispensation of the Law, but persons may be referred to by the neuter in abstract speech: see John vi. 37; 1 John v. 4. For the thought cf. Rom. xi. 32.

that] i.e. in order that. 'But if [the Law] was given for this reason, that it should shut all up, that is, that it should convict and show them their own personal faults, not only does it not hinder thee obtaining the promise, but it even helps to obtain it...For since the Jews neither perceived their own sins, nor (as they did not perceive them) desired forgiveness, He gave the Law which would convict them of their wounds, in order that they might long for the Physician' (Chrys.).

the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given] 'by (lit. 'of') faith'; cf. the reading 'of the law,' *v.* 21: 'faith of Jesus Christ,' i.e. faith in Him; cf. ii. 16. It is possible to take the phrase 'by faith of Jesus Christ' closely with 'the promise' (so Ell.), the promise belonging to faith not to works; but as this hardly brings out the full meaning of 'of'

23 given to them that believe. But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should

it is better to join the phrase with 'might be given': 'in order that the promise should, as a result of faith in Jesus Christ, be given to them that believe.' Had the Law brought righteousness this would not have been necessary, but the Scripture included all under sin for this express purpose. It could not be given till Christ came; cf. *v.* 23.

to them that believe] In one emphatic word he sums up the argument of *vv.* 7—22.

23—iv. 7. *The contrast between our former state of pupillage under the Law, and our present state in Christ, full sonship.*

This is brought out under two aspects:

I. *vv.* 23—29. The preparative character of the Law; faith in Christ makes us Abraham's seed. (*a*) *vv.* 23, 24. We were protected by the Law with the hope of the future faith. The Law has been our paedagogue, leading us to Christ. (*b*) *vv.* 25—29. Now we are all sons of God by our faith in Christ, and therefore Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise.

II. iv. 1—7. Temporary submission to laws, for those who are in an inferior position, is common. But Christ has delivered us and brought us into full sonship, as our experience tells us.

23, 24. *A more positive answer to the question of v.* 19. *The Law was distinctly preparative.*

(*v.* 23) We Jews were protected—the Law leaving us no room to escape from its power—that we should at last be brought into the faith that was about to be revealed. (*v.* 24) So that the Law has become our moral guide unto Christ (Messiah), in order that we should be justified of faith.

23. *But before faith came*] *v.* 22 suggests to St Paul that he should (*vv.* 23, 24) dwell on the temporary and preparative character of the Law, a point which he touched upon in *v.* 19, 'till the seed should come.' 'Faith,' the R.V. marg. has 'the faith,' but the article of the original only resumes the faith of *v.* 22. It is almost 'this faith of which I speak,' hardly 'the dispensation of faith.'

we were kept] 'in ward,' R.V. 2 Cor. xi. 32; Phil. iv. 7; 1 Pet. i. 5†. 'We' = we Jews, who alone were under the Law. In the last two of these three passages 'keep' ('guard,' R.V.) has the connotation of protecting rather than keeping in prison. So probably here; not therefore as the R.V. 'kept in ward.' The various laws were, as Chrysostom and Theodoret say, a wall to the Israelites, or, as Jewish writers say, a 'hedge' against sins of the heathen (see Schechter, *Some Aspects*, pp. 206 sq.).

shut up] *v.* 22 note. It describes the nature of the imprisonment; we were shut up.

unto] Preferably with the principal verb 'we were kept.' The guard of the Law was with the aim that we should pass over into faith.

afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was our school- 24
master *to bring us* unto Christ, that we might be justified by

the faith which should afterwards be revealed] Here also 'faith' can hardly be 'the dispensation of faith.'

24. A change of metaphor from protection by a guard to a 'tutor,' i.e. here the beneficent action of the Law is more directly indicated. In all probability too we should place a full stop at the end of this verse, joining *v.* 25 closely with the following verses. On the other hand the thought of the paedagogue is too akin to much of the contents of *vv.* 25—iv. 7 to warrant our making (with Weiss) *v.* 24 the end of a section beginning at *v.* 15. It naturally leads on to 'sons.'

Wherefore] 'So that,' R.V. Though about to change the metaphor St Paul draws his conclusion from *v.* 23.

the law] i.e. the Mosaic Law. *was*] 'hath been,' R.V.

schoolmaster] 'tutor,' R.V. 'Zuchtmeister,' Luther; 'conducteur,' Osterwald; properly 'paedagogus': *v.* 25, 1 Cor. iv. 15. Lightfoot quotes a long and instructive passage illustrating the use of this word from Plato, *Lysis*, p. 208 c. The Paedagogus looked after boys from seven to seventeen years of age, his duties being in Greek households solely moral and disciplinary, in Roman also, and perhaps chiefly, educational. Here there is no hint of instruction being given by him, but of his disciplinary protection such as 'kept' might suggest. It is however unreasonable to deduce from this (with Ramsay, *Gal.* pp. 381 sqq.) that the Epistle was written to Churches in South Galatia where Greek influence was more prevalent. For it is very doubtful whether the North Galatians had definitely Roman customs. Compare, for the subject generally, Appendix, Note C.

It is worthy of note that in the Rabbinic writings the word is used in the same disciplinary sense as here, e.g. as a king sends his son's *Paedagogue* to turn him back from his evil ways, so God sends Jeremiah to Israel (*Debarim R.*, Parasha II. on Dt. iv. 30).

Thus the Law is described as exercising a sound moral influence over us with the view of bringing us to Christ. Except that Christ is not here regarded as a schoolmaster Theodoret's words are excellent: 'It fulfilled for us the function of a Paedagogus. It freed us from our former impiety, and trained us in the knowledge of God, and brings us to our Master Christ as it were to a wise teacher, that we may be instructed by Him in perfect learning, and may obtain the righteousness which is by faith.'

unto Christ] not Jesus, because not the historical person but the expected Messiah is under consideration.

that we might be justified by faith] ii. 16 note.

25—29. See note at *v.* 23.

(*v.* 25) But when that faith came—we believers are no longer under a paedagogue. (*v.* 26) For all (not Jews only) of you are sons of God (with full privileges) by means of your faith in Messiah who has come, I mean Jesus. (*v.* 27) I say 'all,' for as many of you as were baptized

25 faith. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under
26 a schoolmaster. For ye are all the children of God by faith

into union with Christ, put on Christ with all He is and has. (*v.* 28) I say 'all' in the fullest sense of the word, for in our relation to Christ distinctions of nationality and social standing cease to be, and even those of sex are not counted, for you all are one person in Christ Jesus. (*v.* 29) What does this imply? Nothing less than that if you, even you Galatians, are Christ's then ye are (as He is) Abraham's seed, and in accordance with promise (not in accordance with the Law) heirs of all that is promised to Abraham's seed.

25. To be joined with the following, not the preceding, verses. St Paul is always practical. He will, if possible, wean the Galatians from the error of going back to the Law, and he here begins to state their privileges in Christ.

But after that faith is come] The article in the Greek before 'faith' is resumptive as in *vv.* 20, 23.

we are no longer under a schoolmaster] 'For paedagogues are useful for young boys because of their youth. But they are not needful, when the boy has been formed by practice, and has advanced to full learning' (Theodore of Mopsuestia). Thus the Law is not opposed to grace by preparing for it; it is only opposed to it if we stay in it after grace has come (cf. Chrys.). 'Are.' Probably St Paul has here passed to thinking of all believers. In *v.* 26 he turns directly to the Galatians.

26. *For ye are all, etc.*] It has been thought that *vv.* 26—29 are an appeal to the experience of the Galatians; having, as they have found, all these privileges, they surely cannot be any more under the Law. But it is questionable whether this does not assume too much experimental religion on the part of the Galatians, and also there is no appeal (as in *vv.* 2, 5) to their reception of the Spirit or the existence of miraculous or other gifts. It is better therefore to understand the verses as laying down principles. You are no longer under a paedagogue, for, as I must remind you, you are already sons of God in Christ, yes, all are received in Him, and if you are in Him then you are Abraham's seed, heirs according to promise.

For] Not merely giving the reason for saying 'all' ('why he ranks Galatians and Jews together'), but for speaking of their freedom in *v.* 25.

all] Primarily whether Jews or Gentiles, but it serves as an occasion for mentioning various conditions of life in *v.* 28.

children] 'sons,' R.V. More than 'children' (*v.* 7 note).

of God] Here added not in contrast to Abraham (*v.* 7) as being greater, but rather as being the fundamental privilege of believers, which proves itself eventually to carry with it the further privilege (which has been so much under discussion) of being sons of Abraham (*v.* 29). But in itself it does not bear the emphasis of the sentence. That is chiefly on 'sons' (in contrast to those under a paedagogus), though formally on 'all.'

by faith] Here probably 'your faith.'

in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized 27
into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor 28
Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male

in Christ Jesus] Faith centred on Christ and resting in Him, Col. i. 4; Eph. i. 15. These parallels make it improbable that the words 'in Christ Jesus' are to be taken with 'are sons of God' as R.V.; cf. also *v.* 22. The names are in this order (contrast *v.* 22) because 'Christ' takes up *v.* 24, and 'Jesus' is an addition expressly identifying Messiah with Jesus.

27. In *vv.* 27, 28 St Paul shows how they obtained their sonship (Theodoret).

For] beginning to prove the truth of the whole statement in *v.* 26.

have been ('were,' R.V.) *baptized into Christ*] Cf. Col. ii. 12. For 'baptism into' a person see Rom. vi. 3; 1 Cor. x. 2. Cf. 'baptism into the Name,' Mt. xxviii. 19 al. Christ was the aim and purpose of your baptism, and through it you obtained union with even Him.

have ('did,' R.V.) *put on Christ*] i.e. you appropriated the relation to God in which Christ stands, you received all that Christ is. There is no thought here of putting off the old man of sinful desires (Col. iii. 8—12), but only of leaving the previous state of pupillage by union with Christ.

28. *There is*] 'can be,' R.V. 'There cannot be'; see Hort on Jas. i. 17, p. 30. St Paul mentions differences of nation, social standing, and sex.

neither Jew nor Greek] In Col. iii. 11 'and,' i.e. the peculiarities of both remain but are not reckoned; here peculiarities disappear in Christ.

neither bond nor free] These form a more marked division than in Col., where 'bond,' 'free' occur only at the end of a list.

there is ('can be,' R.V.) *neither male nor female*] 'no male and female,' R.V. Not in Col. He does not say in this case 'neither,' 'nor' for these peculiarities must remain, but they are not regarded as forming separate entities, two of a series, when in relation to Christ. St Paul's words strike at the root of that belief in the superiority of the male sex in religious privileges and powers which marks the lower types of religion, even Mohammadanism and popular Judaism down to our own day, included as it doubtless is under the well-known daily prayer of the Jew, 'Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast not made me a woman' (*Authorised Daily Prayer Book*, ed. Singer, p. 6), where, as here, it follows the mention of heathen and slaves. This makes it unlikely that St Paul had in his mind the sayings current in the Greek schools, of gratitude for being a man rather than a woman. For there the mention of a dumb animal had come first. See quotations in C. Taylor's *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, 2nd edit., pp. 26, 137 sqq.

Ramsay (pp. 389 sqq.) adduces these words in support of the South Galatian theory, stating that in that district the position of woman was

29 nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye *be* Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.

unusually high, and that therefore St Paul could make this statement in writing to them, for his 'allusion to the equality of the sexes in the perfect form which the Church must ultimately attain would not seem to the people of these Graeco-Phrygian cities to be so entirely revolutionary and destructive of existing social conditions as it must have seemed to the Greeks,' e.g. at Corinth. This seems fanciful, especially as it does not appear that there is any reason for thinking it would have been disliked at Colossae (see above).

for ye] Emphatic: even you Galatians in all your various national, social, and even family relations.

are all] Emphatic repetition from *v.* 26.

are all one in Christ Jesus] Apparently St Paul means 'one *man*' (R.V.), as expressly in Eph. ii. 15, on which Dean Arm. Robinson writes (p. 65): 'Henceforth God deals with man as a whole, as a single individual, in Christ. Not as Two Men, the privileged and unprivileged—Two, parted one from the other by a barrier in the most sacred of all the relations of life: but as One Man, united in a peace, which is no mere alliance of elements naturally distinct, but a concorporation, the common life of a single organism.' Wetstein has a remarkable quotation from Lucian, *Toxaris* 46 (§ 53), showing how others ought to treat us as though they formed one man with us, not professing gratitude to us any more than our left hand should profess gratitude to our right etc.

Chrysostom understands by it only that all believers have 'one form, one pattern, that of Christ'; each, whether Jew or Gentile etc., walking with the form not of an angel or archangel, but of the Lord of all, showing Christ in himself. But, beautiful as this thought is, it comes short of St Paul's meaning.

29. *And if ye* be *Christ's*] Observe the emphasis on 'ye.' If ye, ye Galatians, Gentiles though you are, are Christ's, then etc. If you belong to Christ, as surely you do after the close relation implied in your faith in Him (*v.* 26), your baptism into Him, your putting of Him on (*v.* 27), your union in Him (*v.* 28), then we must conclude that you are Abraham's seed, with all that this implies of promise and heirship. St Paul insists once more that the blessing of Abraham is only to be obtained in Christ, and is obtained in Him.

then are ye Abraham's seed] 'It is not possible for the head to be reckoned his (Abraham's), and the body some other's' (Theodoret).

heirs] In the original the closing and emphatic word, implying possession actually received, not merely in expectancy. St Paul has mentioned heirship definitely only in *v.* 18, where see note, though he has implied it in *vv.* 24—26. You want to be heirs of all that true relationship to Abraham brings—you have obtained it in Christ.

according to the promise] The phrase occurs absolutely elsewhere in

Now I say, *That* the heir, as long as he is a child, 4

Ac. xiii. 23, and with the addition of 'life,' 2 Tim. i. 1†. 'According to promise' (R.V.) in contrast to the Law and its deeds.

Then, characteristically enough, St Paul takes up the word 'heirs,' and makes it a starting-point for further thoughts about God's dealings with us in the past and present.

CHAPTER IV.

1—7. (See note at iii. 23.) *Temporary submission to laws, by which one is in an inferior position, is common. But we have been delivered from these by Christ's coming, as the testimony of our hearts tells us. Each believer is a son and heir by the grace of God.*

(*v.* 1) But I say (in contrast to the thought of freedom and power suggested by 'heir') while an heir is a child he does not differ from a slave though in fact lord of all. (*v.* 2) But he is under guardians and stewards, until the time fixed by his father. (*v.* 3) So we also (first we Jews, but Gentiles as well) when we were children were enslaved under the elementary rules connected with merely external things. (*v.* 4) But when the time was filled up—the time appointed by God, with its effect on us in discipline—God sent out from Himself His Son, who passed through the stages of humanity and entered on life as a Jew, to experience fully the claims and effect of the Law, (*v.* 5) in order that He might redeem those who were under His discipline of the Law, and therefore, if them, others also, in order that (this redemption being accomplished) all we believers may receive in correspondence with the promises our adoption by grace into His family. (*v.* 6) But, to give a proof that ye now are sons, God sent out from Himself the spirit of His Son into our hearts crying (with a fervour that compels a foreign word to be translated into our mother tongue) 'Abba,' 'Father'! (*v.* 7) So that (after God's work external and internal) thou (each believer) art no longer a slave but a son, and if a son then also an heir, both facts, that of sonship and becoming an heir, being by (the power and grace, I say, of) God.

1. *Now I say*] The exact Greek phrase occurs elsewhere in St Paul's writings only in v. 16, where, as here, it introduces a sharp contrast; here to heirship (iii. 29) and what it seems to imply; there to a wrong means of success. Contrast iii. 17, v. 2; and Rom. x. 18.

as long as] The full form of the Greek (Rom. vii. 1; 1 Cor. vii. 39†) lays the greater stress on the duration of the time; contrast Mark ii. 19 and also Mt. ix. 15.

a child] If St Paul were writing a legal document the Greek word would doubtless = *infans*, *minor*, who in Roman law did not attain his majority till he was twenty-five years old. But it is more natural to suppose that in this letter to the people he uses the term more generally, as it is always used in the N.T., of children in contrast to adults; cf.

differeth nothing from a servant, though he be lord of all;
2 but is under tutors and governors until the time appointed
3 of the father. Even so we, when we were children, were in

1 Cor. xiii. 11; Eph. iv. 14; Heb. v. 13. The Vulgate rightly gives *parvulus*; Wyclif 'a litil child.'

a servant] 'a bondservant,' R.V. Wetstein quotes a long and interesting passage from Dio Chrys. xv. p. 240 A, showing the power of fathers to even kill their sons.

though he be lord of all] Over all the things given to him by the father. In reality, if the father is regarded as dead; potentially, if as alive. See the following notes.

2. *but is under tutors*] 'guardians,' R.V. The same word is translated 'steward' in Mt. xx. 8 and Luke viii. 3†. See Appendix, Note C. Any person to whom authority is committed, whether a Procurator, e.g. Cumanus in Joseph. *Ant.* XX. 6. 2 (§ 132), or only a bailiff over labourers, Mt. xx. 8. In Luke viii. 3 Chuza may have been Herod's 'agent' or 'factor' generally, or may have had special charge of the royal children. So Lysias was the guardian of Antiochus Epiphanes, 2 Mac. xi. 1, xiii. 2, xiv. 2. In our verse it is to be translated 'guardians' or 'tutors' (in the old sense of the word with no reference to teaching) according as the father is thought of as dead or as alive.

The plural both here and in the next substantive is purposely vague. It marks the father's freedom to appoint as many as he would, either contemporaneously or successively. The singular would have meant that the heir had but one guardian and one steward.

and governors] 'stewards,' R.V. Luke xii. 42, xvi. 1, 3, 8; Rom. xvi. 23; 1 Cor. iv. 1—2; Tit. i. 7; 1 Pet. iv. 10†. In all these passages the steward administers property, whether material or spiritual. So here the stewards are those who administer the property of the heir. But whether the father is regarded as dead or only absent is not clear.

until the time ('term,' R.V.) *appointed of the father*] If the father is regarded as alive there is no difficulty; if as dead there is. For ordinarily under Roman law a minor came of age at twenty-five, being under a *tutor* till 14 and a *curator* till 25 (Ramsay, *Gal.* p. 392). But it seems that in certain cases the father was allowed some discretion in this. See Dawson Walker, *The Gift of Tongues* etc., pp. 118, 119, 168. Compare our own law, according to which a minor generally comes into his property at twenty-one, but not always, if the father makes special provision to the contrary. See further Appendix, Note C.

3. *Even so we*] We Jews primarily, though not exclusively, for the restraints were felt by all until Christ came.

when we were children] *v.* 1. What a claim for the greatness of the change brought by the Gospel!

were in bondage] 'were held in bondage,' R.V. The form in the Greek lays stress on the permanency of the result of the action.

bondage under the [1]elements of the world: but when the 4
fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made
of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were 5

[1] Or, *rudiments.*

under the elements] 'rudiments,' R.V. with Geneva 1557. The full phrase is found in Col. ii. 8, 20 (where see the notes in the C.G.T.), 'elements' alone in *v.* 9; Heb. v. 12; 2 Pet. iii. 10, 12†. The phrase means not (*a*) the physical elements as such, nor (*b*) the spiritual beings, angels, directing the physical elements, but (*c*) the rudiments, the A, B, C of outward things, elementary beggarly rules connected with the external and the visible, e.g. the observance of sabbaths, new moons etc. (*v.* 10), as ordered in the Law, written or oral, or the many ceremonies of the heathen. These external checks on personal freedom answer to the guardians and stewards of *v.* 2.

4. *but when*] The coming of Christ marks the beginning of the change in our personal relation to God.

the fulness of the time was come] The full phrase occurs here only in the Greek Bible. Compare Eph. i. 10, 'the fulness of the times'; and especially Mark i. 15, 'the time is fulfilled,' with Dr Swete's note. Pre-Christian time was like an unfilled measure, which each year filled, as it were drop by drop, until the fulness of it came. St Paul here speaks only of the lapse of time; he does not make any suggestion as to what determined that time, e.g. conviction of sin etc.; cf. iii. 19, 24.

God sent forth] The Greek word implies 'out of heaven from Himself.' *v.* 6. Here only with Christ for the object. Used of the word (i.e. message) of salvation in St Paul's speech at Antioch of Pisidia (Ac. xiii. 26 sqq.), wherein are other thoughts even more typical of our Epistle, centring round the words 'fulfil,' 'promise,' 'tree,' 'justify.' See Introduction, pp. xxxi. sq.

made ('born,' R.V.) *of a woman, made* ('born,' R.V.) *under the law*] Not a mere parenthesis, but to show that 'His Son' had likeness of nature with us, and likeness of condition under the Law (ii. 16 note); even Christ passed through the stage of a child (*v.* 1), for only thus could He accomplish His object. 'Under the law.' 'As friend and Redeemer of "sinners" he must go where the sense of sin was most acute' (B. W. Bacon).

5. *to* ('that he might,' R.V.) *redeem*] The clause is probably to be taken with the whole of the preceding words from 'sent forth,' of which indeed 'made...law' are in a sense epexegetic.

'Redeem,' iii. 13; cf. 1 Cor. vi. 20, vii. 23. St Paul and his readers cannot have been ignorant of the method by which slaves were often set free, viz. that of the master receiving from a temple the sale-price of his slave, who has himself deposited the sum with the temple authorities for that purpose. The slave is nominally bought to become the slave of the god, but he is in reality free, with the god for his protector.

An inscription of 200/199 B.C. at Delphi runs, 'Apollo the Pythian

under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.
6 And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of

bought from Sosibius of Amphissa, *for freedom*, a female slave, whose name is Nicaea...*with a price* of three minae of silver and a half-mina... The *price* he has received. The purchase, however, Nicaea hath committed unto Apollo, *for freedom*' (Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 234; E. T. p. 327). For 'for freedom' see the notes on v. 1, 13. It is less probable that St Paul was thinking of one Roman method of adoption in which the transference was made from the power of the natural father to that of the adoptive father by a series of fictitious sales (see Appendix, Note C).

them that were under the law] i.e. Jews, and, if them, much more others who were not under the same strict discipline. There may also be the further thought that if Jews were set free from the Law, much more were Gentiles not to be brought under it. 'Tantum abest, ut eos, quibus lex lata non fuit, jugo legis subjecerit, ut et ipsos Judaeos liberatum venerit' (Wetstein).

that] Dependent on 'redeem.' Observe that by 'Chiasmus' the clause of the first 'that' answers to 'born under the law,' and that of the second to 'born of a woman.'

we might receive] Col. iii. 24. 'We'=all believers. The Greek word implies that this reception is, in a sense, due, i.e. corresponding to the promises. 'He gave us the adoption of sons that He had promised us' (Theodoret). Hardly 'as children were always sons, and only receive back what was originally designed for us' (Jowett).

the adoption of sons] The article=that 'adoption of sons' of which we all know, or perhaps 'our.' 'Adoption of sons,' Rom. viii. 15, 23. ix. 4; Eph. i. 5. Before, we were only potentially sons (*v.* 1), and were in fact enslaved (*v.* 3), but now are both recognized as sons officially and enjoy the privileges of the position. Observe 'adoption,' for strictly we have no claim. It is of God's grace that we become members of His family in the truest sense. See Appendix, Note C.

6. With this and verse 7 cf. Rom. viii. 15—17. Sonship implies privileges, in this case spiritual, yes, the possession of the Spirit of God's Son with His utterance within us of dependence on the Father. In iii. 26, 27 sonship is connected with putting on Christ, here with receiving His Spirit.

And because ye are sons] 'And because,' 'But as a proof that,' rather than strictly causal. 'Ye are,' for St Paul will bring the truth home to the Galatians.

hath (om. R.V.) *sent forth*] *v.* 4 note. The parallel is exact; as His Son into the world, so the Spirit of His Son into our hearts. For the thought compare Col. i. 12.

the Spirit of his Son] Compare Isa. xlviii. 16, rightly translated by Bengel (on *v.* 4): 'Dominus Jehovah misit me suumque Spiritum,' and so probably the LXX. On 'the Spirit' see Appendix, Note F.

his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore 7

into your hearts] 'our,' R.V. with the best authorities. St Paul reverts quickly to the first person; cf. ii. 18 note. Bp Chase writes 'confirmation is the Pentecost of the individual soul' (*Confirmation in the Apostolic Age*, p. 88).

crying] i.e. the Spirit. In Rom. viii. 15 St Paul has modified his words to 'the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry.' The close conjunction of the Holy Spirit with our own personality forms a contrast to Mark v. 9 and parallels.

Abba, Father] For the Aramaic Abba cf. Bar-abbas. The bilingual phrase occurs also in Rom. viii. 15 in a context similar to our passage, and in Mark xiv. 36†, our Lord's utterance in the Garden. Thus in all three passages it is expressive of the deepest feeling. But why both terms? In the Gospel the second may perhaps be by way of explanation for Gentile readers, but this hardly suits the thought of the Epistles. Rather Abba had lost somewhat of its original force, and the fervour of the human speaker was not satisfied without adding the equivalent in his ordinary Greek tongue. If so St Paul's mother tongue would seem to have been not Aramaic but Greek.

For a similar case see Apoc. i. 7 ('Even so, Amen') where the change is in the reverse order, from Greek to Hebrew, as was natural if St John was the author. Akin to this explanation is another that the readiness of the bilingual Palestinian Church to use both Aramaic and Greek in prayer had spread to other countries.

Perhaps all the passages are to be connected with the Lord's Prayer, probably in the form answering to that of St Luke's narrative, in which alone the first word in Aramaic would be Abba, the Aramaic being here retained from peculiar sacredness of association (Moulton, *Proleg.* p. 10; cf. Chase, *Lord's Prayer*, p. 23). It is possible that St Paul by using both terms also wished to suggest the impartiality of the Spirit's work in believers, whether they be Jews or Gentiles. Dr Swete thinks that if the double phrase is a reminiscence of the words used by our Lord it suggests that 'the adopted children of God reveal their sonship in the same spirit of filial submission which marked the Only Son' (*The Holy Spirit in the N. T.* p. 205).

The only other Aramaic words employed as such by St Paul are *Maran atha* in 1 Cor. xvi. 22.

Illustrations of similar bilingual or even trilingual expressions are given in Schoettgen on Mark xiv. 36: e.g. T. B. *Erubin*, 53^{b}, a Galilean woman is ridiculed as saying *māri kiri*, 'my lord, my servant,' though intending *māri qiri*, 'my lord, my lord,' and *Sh^{e}moth R.* § 46. 3, in a Mashal a physician's son addresses a mountebank (presumably a quack) as *qiri, māri, ābi*, 'my lord, my lord, my father,' much to his own father's displeasure.

7. *Wherefore*] 'So that' (R.V.), after God's work in sending His Son for you and His Spirit within you, with the effect of the latter on your very language.

thou art no more a servant, but a son; and if a son, then an
8 heir of God through Christ. Howbeit then, when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are

thou art] For a similar personal appeal to the individual see vi. 1; Rom. xii. 20, 21; 1 Cor. iv. 7.

no more] Though once, yet no longer. How then can you think of going back?

a servant] 'bondservant,' R.V. *v.* 3.

heir (iii. 29) *of God through Christ*] The R.V. has simply 'through God' in accordance with the best authorities. The short and solemn ending attributes the means all to God, not to themselves, and reminds them alike of His past training under the Law and of His recent work for them. It refers not only to 'heir' but also to the sonship of which St Paul has been speaking; hardly however to the word 'son' as such.

8—11. *Appeal: after so great a change how can you go back!*

(*v.* 8) But—before your conversion, when you knew not God, ye were slaves to them which by origin are not gods; (*v.* 9) and now when you have come to know God, or rather were known by God!—how are ye turning again to the powerless and poverty-stricken rudiments, to which ye are wishing to become slaves again from the very beginning of the alphabet? (*v.* 10) Ye are scrupulously marking days, and new moons, and the exact times of feasts, and years! (*v.* 11) (Transition.) You cause me dread lest I have laboured for you for nothing.

8. This and the following verses are a 'startling and sad contrast to *v.* 7' (Beet), seen in their turning back to the weak and beggarly elements.

Howbeit] To be joined with 'how turn ye again' (*v.* 9), which expresses the principal thought of the passage, the intervening words serving as a preparation for 'again.'

then] 'at that time,' R.V. Rom. vi. 21. Before their conversion, which was implied in 'thou art no longer a bondservant' (*v.* 7), St Paul here directly applying to Gentiles the language of *vv.* 1—7, which had referred primarily to the Jews.

when ye knew not God] For 'knowing God' see 1 Th. iv. 5; 2 Th. i. 8; Tit. i. 16†. They lacked any natural or intuitive knowledge of God.

ye did service] The form of the Greek suggests more willingness and personal action than 'were held in bondage' in *v.* 3.

unto them which by nature (ii. 15) *are no gods*] 'dieux qui ne *le* sont point de *leur* nature' (Osterwald). i.e. Whatever may be attributed to them by their worshippers; if they are gods they are not so by origin, but by man's deification of them; cf. 1 Cor. viii. 4, 5. Observe that this would include both the worship of Caesar (though so expressed that no offence could be taken) and that of demons (1 Cor. x. 19, 20), as well as all other forms of heathen worship. In Alford's trans-

no gods. But now, after that ye have known God, or rather 9
are known of God, how turn ye [1]again to the weak and
beggarly [2]elements, whereunto ye desire again to be in

[1] Or, *back.* [2] Or, *rudiments.*

lation 'to gods, which by nature exist not,' 'by nature' is really tautological.

9. *But now*] Since your conversion; answering to 'then.'

after that ye have known God] The verb is different from that in *v.* 8. It means having learned, having 'come to know' (R.V.) by personal acquaintance. St Paul does not state the means of their knowledge, but he at once proceeds to prevent their taking any credit for it.

or rather (Rom. viii. 34) *are known of God*] '(have come) to be known of God,' R.V. The initiative was not theirs, neither was their knowledge complete. Observe further that knowledge of them by God implies His recognition of them as His (Ex. xxxiii. 12, 17); cf. 1 Cor. viii. 3. Probably there is also a distinct reference to His 'knowledge' of them by adopting them as sons, *v.* 5. 'To know God as God, is to be in vital fellowship with Him, to love Him, to fulfil that relation towards Him for which we are born. And conversely to be known by God, to be the object of His knowledge, is to be in harmony with Him' (Westcott on 1 John ii. 3).

how turn ye (contrast 1 Th. i. 9) *again* (v. 1) *to the weak and beggarly elements*] *v.* 3 note. He does not say or mean 'them which by nature are no gods' (cf. *v.* 8), but, as always, when apparently about to repeat himself, introduces a fresh point. Thus here 'elements' does not = gods, but what they represent, the mere rudiments of religion. The epithets show their lack of spiritual power and of spiritual wealth.

Observe that St Paul here regards Judaism and the heathen religions as so far alike that they both represent Law in contrast to Grace, rudiments in contrast to advanced knowledge, weakness in contrast to strength, poverty in contrast to wealth. He is not concerned with the nobler and more spiritual side of the O.T. religion, but with that which it had in common, whether by origin or only in character, with heathenism. This includes not only the ceremonial but also the moral law in so far as this is regarded apart from Christ.

Luther is essentially right in saying 'Doth Paul take it to be all one thing, to fall from the promise to the law, from faith to works, and to do service unto gods which by nature are no gods? I answer: whosoever is fallen from the article of Justification, is ignorant of God, and an idolator.... The reason is, because God will or can be known no otherwise than by Christ.... There is no mean between man's working and the knowledge of Christ. If this knowledge be darkened or defaced, it is all one whether thou be a Monk, a Turk, a Jew etc.' (on *vv.* 8, 9).

whereunto ye desire (*v.* 21) *again to be in bondage*] 'to be in bondage over again,' R.V., literally 'again anew'; cf. Wisd. xix. 6‡ 'The whole creation, each part in its several kind, was fashioned again anew.' The

10 bondage? Ye observe days, and months, and
11 years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain.

combination means that they purpose *relapsing* to the bondage of the 'rudiments' and practising them all over again *from the very beginning*; cf. Barn. § 16. 8, 'we became new, created again from the beginning.'

10. Epexegetic of the way in which they are already showing their slavery to pre-Christian customs. Only the observance of times is mentioned here; in Col. ii. 16 this is preceded by that of foods. Notice also that here the times ascend from days to years; there they descend from yearly feasts to days.

Ye observe] This word properly does not signify 'keep,' or 'spend in proper fashion,' but 'mark' or 'watch,' so that they do not slip by unobserved. So in Sus. *v.* 15 (Th.) watching for a favourable day. The word is very suitably used of the painful observance of the exact moment of the beginning and end of sacred days practised by Jews, and presumably by many heathen. Josephus, however (*Ant.* III. 5. 5 [§ 91]), giving the substance of the fourth commandment, seems to use it less strictly, of observing the seventh day by abstaining from every kind of work.

days] Presumably Jewish sabbaths. On the question how far the observance of Sundays comes under St Paul's condemnation here and in Col. ii. 16 see note there, in C.G.T.

and months] The observance of the New Moon.

and times] 'seasons,' R.V. Hardly with reference to the heathen care for lucky days, but to Jewish feasts. See Lev. xxiii. 4. So also probably Gen. i. 14.

and years] The Greek word occurs here only in St Paul's writings. The reference seems to be to the Sabbatical years, hardly to the feast of the New Year with its closely subsequent Day of Atonement, and to the importance of this for welfare in the ensuing twelve months.

11. *I am afraid of you*] Not 'I fear for you,' for the Greek verb with an accusative of the person never has this meaning in the Greek Bible, and very seldom, if ever (cf. Soph. *Oed. R.* 760 [767]), elsewhere; but 'I fear you,' i.e. you cause me dread from the effect that your action will have on my work.

lest] R.V. adds 'by any means'; cf. ii. 2 with similar context. Moulton (*Proleg.* 1906, p. 193) translates 'perhaps I have toiled in vain.'

I have bestowed upon you labour] In Col. i. 29 as here St Paul uses the verb of himself when turning to speak in detail of his interest in those to whom he is writing.

in vain] i.e. 'without due result,' iii. 4.

12—20. *A further appeal, based on his own behaviour among them, and their treatment of him.*

(*v.* 12) Become, as I became, free from the Law, like you Gentiles, as you saw me when I was among you first. I plead this, brethren,

Brethren, I beseech you, be as I *am;* for I *am* as ye *are:* 12
ye have not injured me at all. Ye know how through 13

for I never had ought but kindness at your hands. (*v.* 13) Far from it. When because of illness I preached the Gospel to you at my first visit, (*v.* 14) you did not despise my illness which must have been a trial to you, but ye received me as though I had been an angel sent from God, yea, even as Christ Himself. (*v.* 15) Where now therefore is your congratulation of yourselves? For I gladly bear my testimony to the sincerity of your love then. You would have plucked out your very eyes and given them to me to help me in my illness! (*v.* 16) So that (for there must be some reason) am I to say that it is my faithful speech to you that has made me your enemy? (*v.* 17) The false teachers are not so conscientious. They pay court to you indeed, but not honourably. They wish to prove you shut out from salvation, that you may pay court to them! (*v.* 18) But it is good to be paid court to in a good cause, always, and not only when I am present with you (to exert my influence upon you, so that you may deserve to be paid court to by all), (*v.* 19) my little children, with whom I am once more undergoing the pangs of motherhood, until Christ be formed in you. (*v.* 20) But I would I were (as I said) present with you, and so speak not in severity but praise—because, as things are, I am at a loss about you.

12. *Brethren* (i. 11 note), *I beseech you*] For the urgency of the entreaty see 2 Cor. v. 20, viii. 4.

be as I am] i.e. in my freedom from the Law. St Paul is addressing Gentile Christians, as the majority of the Galatian converts undoubtedly were. Quite improbable is the explanation: Resemble me in affection; I love you, therefore do ye love me.

for I am *as ye* are] For I was, or became, like you, i.e. a Gentile in my ways. St Paul probably has in his mind especially his first entrance among them and his disregard of Jewish conventionalities, in order that he might win them to Christ, 1 Cor. ix. 21.

ye have not injured me at all] 'ye did me no wrong,' R.V. The connexion of thought is difficult. (1) Perhaps the simplest is the best. I am encouraged to plead with you, for I never received ought but kindness at your hands, least of all when I came first among you.

(2) Ramsay (*Gal.* pp. 428 sq.) connects the words only with the following verses. He emphasizes the aorist in contrast with their present behaviour, and also thinks that the words are an adaptation of a phrase used by the Galatians. 'You say with truth in your letter that "you do not wrong me."...I bear witness that you *did* not....But you are doing so now (*v.* 16): you are troubling me (vi. 17).'

13. *Ye know*] 'But ye know,' R.V. 'But' contrasts the supposition of injury. So far from unkindness was your treatment of me that even when it might have been unkind, it was not.

through infirmity ('because of an infirmity,' R.V.) *of the flesh*] Illness was the cause of St Paul's first evangelistic efforts among the

infirmity of the flesh I preached the gospel unto you at
14 the first. And my temptation which was in my flesh ye

Galatians. Of the nature of the illness we know nothing, save that *v.* 15 suggests that it seriously affected his eyes. 'A very early tradition defined the complaint; "pain, as it is said, in the ear or head" (Tertullian, *de Pudic.* § 13). And this statement is copied or confirmed by Jerome (*in loco*), "tradunt eum gravissimum capitis dolorem saepe perpessum"' (Lightfoot, *Gal.* p. 183).

Ramsay (*Gal.* pp. 420 sqq.), in the interests of the S. Galatian theory, argues that this illness explains the visit to the interior in Ac. xiii. 14, saying that St Paul had intended to stay on the coast, and that it was this sudden change of plan which made John Mark leave. But this is to make John Mark's fault greater than ever, if he left St Paul when the latter was ill. It is more likely that Mark's experience of difficulties had already been too much for him, and that as he saw they were likely to increase when St Paul followed out his plan of going inland he felt he could stand them no longer and therefore returned to Jerusalem.

There is no special difficulty in supposing that St Paul was travelling in haste through North Galatia, and was stopped in his journey by illness, and therefore preached to those among whom he was delayed. He does not say that he came, but that he preached, to them because he was ill. See Introduction, p. xxvii.

I preached the gospel] For naturally he would not only build up the converts but also preach to the unconverted.

at the first] 'the first time,' R.V. (1) In itself the Greek phrase may mean 'formerly' (1 Tim. i. 13; John vi. 62, ix. 8; cf. Heb. x. 32; see Blass, *Gram.* § 11. 5). But in each of these instances there is a sharp contrast to the present time, and the phrase is necessary. In our verse this is not so. There is of course a contrast between this verse and *vv.* 16 sq., but if the meaning is 'formerly,' 'long ago,' it adds nothing except vividness and is almost tautological.

(2) Hence it must mean 'the former time' (cf. R.V. marg.; Deut. ix. 18; cf. 1 Chr. xv. 13), in contrast to a second visit paid since. If he was writing to South Galatians the first visit was that of the first Missionary Journey, Ac. xiii. 14—xiv. 23, the second that of the second Missionary Journey, Ac. xvi. 1—5, for Mr D. Round's interpretation is very improbable (see Introd. p. xxxi.). If he was writing to North Galatians the first visit was that of Ac. xvi. 6 (second M. J.), and the second Ac. xviii. 23 (third M. J.).

14. *And my temptation*] 'and that which was a temptation to you,' R.V. The best authorities read literally 'and your temptation,' of which the R.V. gives the right meaning. His illness tested their character. 'And...' is of course dependent on 'how' (*v.* 13).

ye despised not] i.e. the illness which served as your test. The word translated 'despise' is used of St Paul's message (2 Cor. x. 10), and of our Lord's treatment by Herod (Luke xxiii. 11; cf. Mark ix. 12). So of the Servant in lowly and even leper's form Symmachus twice, and

despised not, nor rejected; but received me as an angel of God, *even* as Christ Jesus. [1]Where is then the blessedness you spake of? for I bear you record, that if *it had been* possible, ye would have plucked out your own eyes, and 15

[1] Or, *What was then.*

Aquila and Theodotion once, use the same epithet, translated 'despised' (Isa. liii. 3).

nor rejected] Gr. 'spat out,' R.V. marg. Elsewhere only literally. It may contain an allusion to the then superstitious habit of spitting when meeting sick persons, and especially epileptics, for fear of infection from them (see Clemen, *Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des N.T.* 1909, pp. 266, 288). Used here because 'St Paul is fond of repeating, not without emphasis, compounds presenting the same preposition, ii. 4, 13; Rom. ii. 17, xi. 7 *et al.*' (Meyer).

but received me as an angel (i. 8) *of God*] Probably 'angel' (not 'messenger') as always in St Paul, though the commonness of the word prevents our laying stress on this fact. Observe that they receive him as this in spite of the illness from which he was evidently suffering at the time. This seems to exclude a reference, naturally made much of by Ramsay in support of the South Galatian theory, to the men of Lystra calling St Paul Hermes (the messenger of the gods) because he was the chief speaker (Ac. xiv. 12). Apparently the coincidence is purely accidental. See Introd. pp. xxx. sq.

even *as Christ Jesus*] The connexion in St Paul's mind was probably due to his reminiscence of Mal. iii. 1, 'Behold I send my messenger... and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple; and ("even" R.V. marg.) the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in,' where both the Greek and the Hebrew words for 'messenger' may be translated 'angel.' St Paul means that they could not have received him better if he had been an angel, yea, if he had been Christ Himself.

15. *Where*] The A.V. marg. 'what' is due to the false reading of some late authorities. What has become of it now? Rom. iii. 27.

then] Logically it should still continue.

the blessedness you spake of?] 'that gratulation of yourselves?' R.V. Rom. iv. 6, 9†. Cf. Luke i. 48; Jas. v. 11. Not 'happiness,' or 'blessedness,' which is a different form of the same Greek root, but 'pronouncing blessing,' 'gratulation.' The pronoun is doubtless objective and reflexive, 'of yourselves.' The meaning 'gratulation of you' by other Christians is alien to the context, and for 'your gratulation of me' (cf. Luke i. 48) as bearing so high and acceptable a message we should expect 'gratulation' in the plural.

for I bear you record] I freely bear witness to you of your love. There is no connotation of wishing to convict you of error now by my present testimony.

ye would have plucked out] Mark ii. 4†. Of the eyes Judg. xvi. 21 (A); 1 Sam. xi. 2.

your own eyes] While doubtless the eyes are *carissima membra*

16 have given *them* to me. Am I therefore become your
17 enemy, because I tell you the truth? They zealously affect
you, *but* not well; yea, they would exclude [1]you, that you
18 might affect them. But *it is* good to be zealously affected

[1] Or, *us*.

corporis (Pelag. in Zahn) it seems much more natural to find some special reason for the expression here. Apparently his eyes had been injured by the 'infirmity' of *v.* 13. There is no reason for connecting it with the effect of the vision, Ac. ix. 17, 18, nor with the 'stake in the flesh' (2 Cor. xii. 7).

16. *Am I therefore*] 'So then am I,' R.V. He argues from the fact of the change in their feelings towards him that there must be a reason for it. Has my faithful speech shown that I am an enemy to you?

become your enemy] From my second visit, when I warned you (i. 9), up to now. The phrase means 'an enemy towards you,' not 'held in enmity by you.'

because I tell you the truth] Perhaps better as R.V. marg. 'deal truly with you.' Eph. iv. 15† absolutely, and it would seem including more than speech. Here however predominantly, perhaps solely, of speech; cf. Gen. xlii. 16, 'that your words may be proved, whether there be truth in you.' Zahn makes the sentence a statement instead of a question, describing St Paul's relation to them as he feels it at the moment of writing. But this is jejune.

17. *They zealously affect you*, but *not well*] 'seek you in no good way,' R.V. In contrast to my plain speaking and apparent enmity, the false teachers pay court to you. The close connexion of thought with *v.* 16 makes Ramsay's otherwise attractive explanation improbable, i.e. that the Galatians had in a letter used the phrase 'they take a keen interest in us,' to which St Paul replies, 'Yes, but in no good way; they seek to mislead you to think that they are a superior class to you by right of birth' (cf. *Gal.* p. 429). For this sense of 'pay court to,' 'take warm interest in,' cf. 1 Cor. xii. 31, xiv. 1, 39. In 2 Cor. xi. 2 St Paul uses the same Greek word of his jealousy for his converts.

would exclude you] 'desire to shut you out,' R.V. Rom. iii. 27†. Contrast 'shut up,' iii. 23. 'Shut out' from what? (*a*) Hardly 'from us,' for that in itself would be a comparatively unimportant matter. Nor (*b*) 'in fact from salvation,' St Paul saying that this will be the effect of their teaching if the Galatians listen to them; cf. v. 4. For 'desire' then loses its force. But, as the context suggests, (*c*) 'from salvation,' as the false teachers wished them to believe; they would be excluded from salvation unless they observed the Law.

that you might affect them] 'seek,' R.V. They wish to exclude you (according to their teaching) from salvation in order that you may pay court to them (so as to be included).

18. *But* it is *good to be zealously affected always in a good* thing] Wyclif's 'sue ye the good,' and Rheims' 'but do you emulate the good' are due to the false readings of an imperative adopted in the Vulgate,

always in a good *thing*, and not only when I am present
with you. My little children, of whom I travail in birth 19
again until Christ be formed in you, I desire to be present 20

and found (probably through a mere indifference to spelling) in the two oldest Greek manuscripts. 'It is good to be paid court to in a good cause always.' Who is the subject? (1) Is it St Paul that ought to be courted by the Galatians? It is good for me to be the object of your zeal etc., but for some reason your affections have cooled towards me. This truth is so self-evident as to be hardly worth saying. (2) It is better therefore to understand the words to mean: 'It is good for you to be paid court to always' by me or anybody else, so long as it is done in a good way. You need, that is to say, someone to take an interest in you; I do not grudge this for a moment, provided that it be taken honourably. I do not want you to be dependent on my presence for a true friend. But he implies by 'in a good cause' what he has already stated in *v.* 17 that this interest has not been honourable on the part of the false teachers. Ramsay (*Gal.* pp. 444, 463) ingeniously, but unnecessarily, sees also in the words a hint that the Galatians had expressed their need of some such helper and guide, and that in *v.* 20 he foreshadows his intention of leaving a trusty representative (? Silas) with them.

19. *My little children*] It is best to join this verse closely with *v.* 18, and begin a new sentence at *v.* 20.

of whom I travail in birth again] As though the first time was a failure. 'These words show too the folly of the Novatians, who close the door of repentance' (Theodoret). Cf. the Letter of the Church of Vienne and Lyons of the re-birth of those who had denied Christ: 'The Virgin mother [the Church] had much joy in receiving alive those whom she had brought forth as dead'...'many who had denied were brought forth again and begotten' (Euseb. *Ch. Hist.* v. 1. §§ 45, 46). 'The point of comparison is the loving exertion, which perseveres amidst trouble and pain in the effort to bring about the new Christian life' (Meyer). On St Paul's comparison of himself to a *father* in Phm. 10 see note in the C.G.T.

until Christ be formed‡ *in you*] Cf. Luther, 'bis dass Christus in euch eine Gestalt gewinne,' 'until you have become Christians in whom Christ alone lives, ii. 20' (Weiss). Although the Greek word for 'formed' occurs here only in the Greek Bible its compound is found in Rom. xii. 2; 2 Cor. iii. 18, as well as in Mark ix. 2 || Mt. xvii. 2. The thought is that the life of Christ in the believer may have so perfect a development that every part of the believer himself may be moulded by it and may be the outcome of it (cf. Rom. viii. 29). In contrast to the word translated 'fashion,' a mere external appearance having no organic connexion with that which is within, such as a dress or even a human figure carved in stone, 'form' is the outcome of the inner life. St Paul longs that Christ's transfiguration may become true in each believer. See Lightfoot's classical note on Phil. ii. 7.

20. *I desire*] 'yea, I could wish,' R.V.; 'but I would (if it were

with you now, and to change my voice; for [1]I stand in doubt of you.

[1] Or, *I am perplexed for you.*

possible).' The form of the verb in itself may express a practicable or an impracticable wish. The context alone decides. Here it seems to be impracticable. He cannot come, and he has no immediate prospect of being able to do so.

to be present with you now] I know how helpful I should be, and what a change it would make in our relation to each other.

and to change my voice] Apparently the usual meaning given to the words is right; change my voice of blame, heard in this Epistle, to one of praise and congratulation, as I am sure would be the case if I could but see you.

for] Because, as things are, and judging them at a distance.

I stand in doubt of you] 'I am perplexed about you,' R.V. Moulton and Milligan quote the same Greek word from a papyrus of the 2nd cent. A.D., 'he was [being] ruined by creditors and at his wits' end' (*Expositor*, VII. 6, 1908, p. 189).

21—v. 1. *Another appeal, based upon the principles underlying the history of Hagar and Sarah, and the birth of Isaac. Christ set us free; stand fast therefore in this freedom.*

(*v.* 21) You wish to be under the Law? Listen then to the teaching of the Law itself. (*v.* 22) For it stands written that in Abraham's own children there was a difference, 1st of origin, one being by the bond-servant and the other by the freewoman; 2ndly (*v.* 23) in the circumstances of birth, the bondmaid's son being born in accordance with the natural impulses of the flesh, the freewoman's by means of promise. (*v.* 24) Now things of this kind are written with more than their bare historical meaning. To take first the difference in the mothers. These are two Dispositions; one given forth from Mt Sinai, bearing children born into a state of spiritual bondage, (*v.* 25) I mean Hagar—but the idea of Hagar suits Mt Sinai in distant and desert Arabia—but though distant it is in the same class as the present Jerusalem, for Jerusalem too is in bondage literal and spiritual with those who belong spiritually to her. (*v.* 26) But (I do not say Sarah but rather what she represents) Jerusalem above is free—which is in fact the mother of us believers. (*v.* 27) She, not the present and visible Jerusalem, is our mother, as the prophet has written: Rejoice, thou barren etc., for Sarah the desolate has more children than had Hagar; the unseen Jerusalem has more than the seen. (*v.* 28) I need only mention again the second point of difference, that we are also like Isaac in being children of promise. (*v.* 29) But we are persecuted! Yes even as Isaac, who was born after the spirit, by him who was born after the flesh. (*v.* 30) But Scripture says to us by way of encouragement and command: Cast out the handmaid and her son, for the son of the handmaid shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman. (Remember this for your comfort, and act on it in your

Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear 21
the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, the 22
one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he who 23
was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of

relation to the false teachers.) (*v.* 31) Therefore, as a practical conclusion, we are not children of a bondmaid but of the freewoman! (v. 1) For freedom (nothing less) Christ set us free! Stand fast therefore and do not again be held in the yoke of bondage.

21. Although St Paul is at a loss about the Galatians (*v.* 20) he will try yet another method. He appeals to the very Law itself under which they were wishing to be. The argument of the following verses is subtle, and to us seems to insist unduly on mere words, but to readers more or less accustomed to Jewish interpretations bound up with words and letters as such it had much force. In any case the Jewish writings, as we shall see, afford close parallels to the modes of expression and argument employed by St Paul here. It may also be assumed that the Galatians, even though converts from heathenism, would not find this kind of argument strange. Not only had they in all probability heard it employed by Pauline teachers, and also by the false teachers, both of Jewish origin, but also as heathen they will have been accustomed to deduce lessons from what we should call unimportant parts of oracles or other utterances deemed inspired.

Tell me] Will you not listen to that very Law under which you desire to be?

ye that desire to be under the law] Not 'under law' generally, but under the Jewish Law. See ii. 16 note.

The argument of the following verses put briefly is this: the Law itself tells us that natural birth is no proof of spiritual privileges. The story of Abraham himself shows this. For he had a son who was eventually driven out. All blessings are for him who was by promise.

do ye not hear] This may mean: (*a*) hear in public reading. You act as though you had never heard Abraham's history read out loud: cf. Ac. xv. 21; 2 Cor. iii. 14; (*b*) hear and obey. Will ye not listen to, and act upon, the lessons of the history of Abraham? This interpretation is the simpler. For this use of 'hear' see Mt. xiii. 13. For a similar appeal to Scripture see Mt. xii. 5.

22. *had*] i.e. 'got.'

by a bondmaid] The R.V. reads 'by the handmaid,' but as apparently there were no free servants in early days she would necessarily be a bondmaid. The article = the one mentioned in Scripture.

23. *But*] 'Howbeit,' R.V. There was a further difference between the two sons of the one father.

was ('is,' R.V.) *born*] i.e. either 'stands in Scripture as so born,' or, better, 'still exists' (in the persons of unbelieving Jews). Contrast *v.* 29.

after the flesh] In accordance with the natural impulses of the flesh.

24 the freewoman *was* by promise. Which *things* are an allegory: for these are the two [1]covenants; the one from the

[1] Or, *testaments.*

was *by promise*] Possibly 'by a promise,' iii. 18. Flesh as such was powerless. Promise, nothing less, was the means by which Sarah was enabled to bear Isaac.

St Paul has now stated two differences between the two sons of Abraham. Ishmael was (*a*) of the servant, (*b*) after the flesh; Isaac was (*a*) of the freewoman, (*b*) by means of promise. He first deals with (*a*) in *vv.* 24 *b*—27; and then mentions (*b*) in *v.* 28, not dwelling on this at length, for he has already done so in c. iii.

24. *Which* things] Properly 'now this class of things.'

are an allegory‡] i.e. 'are written with another meaning.' So 'by the which thinges another thing is ment' (Geneva, 1557). For the thought cf. 1 Cor. x. 11.

St Paul does not deny the literal truth of the narratives, but says that besides their literal meaning they have another. He probably would not have restricted himself to the existence of only one other meaning, if others could fairly be deduced from the narratives.

Philo, who himself professes to retain also the literal sense (e.g. *On Abraham*, cc. 15 (§ 68), 20 (§ 99), 24 (§ 119), 29 (§ 147)), is the great example preserved to us of a commentator who continually sees inner, in his case philosophical, meanings in Scripture, but the tendency is universal, and the method is in fact legitimate if the inner meanings are deduced from *principles* underlying the narratives. Rabbinic, as well as Philonic, expositions go far beyond these, deducing, by an exaggerated belief in the inspiration of every word and letter, meanings which the words, or even the letters, may have in other contexts and combinations. In our passage St Paul chiefly deduces his meaning from *principles*; if he does from *words* it is but slightly.

Theodore, against Alexandrian allegorists, insists strongly on the primary sense of Scripture: 'apostolus enim non interimit historiam, neque evolvit res dudum factas; sed sic posuit illa ut tunc fuerant facta, et historiam illorum quae fuerunt facta ad suum usus est intellectum.' So Theodoret, 'He does not do away with the history, but teaches what was prefigured in the history.'

For Philo's interpretation of the incident of Hagar see Ryle in Hastings' *Dict. Bible*, II. 278^{b}; also Lightfoot, pp. 195 sqq.

for these are] i.e. 'these two women are' etc. But possibly the Greek word for 'these' has been attracted into the gender of that for 'covenants' and 'these' means 'these things.'

the (omit R.V.) *two covenants*] The absence of the article in the true text emphasizes the fact that the women do represent 'dispositions' (testaments, see note on iii. 15), and indeed two. It should be noted that this is the first time in this Epistle that St Paul has called the Christian dispensation a *diatheké* (cf. 2 Cor. iii. 6, 14). Previously he distinguished the 'disposition' from the 'promise.' The corrector,

mount [1]Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For *this* Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and [2]answereth to 25

[1] Gr. *Sina.* [2] Or, *is in the same rank with.*

however, who added 'the' was accustomed to regard the two dispensations as two *diathekai*, gaining his knowledge in reality from this passage.

the one] The second is not expressly mentioned, but is taken up in 'Jerusalem which is above,' *v.* 26.

from the mount Sinai] Given forth from Mt Sinai. It is better to retain the comma after 'Sinai.'

to bondage] He cannot say that the 'disposition' at Mt Sinai was a slave (as exactness of verbal parallelism requires), but slavery is the result of being its offspring. It is probably accidental that in the metaphor the status of the child is determined by that of the mother rather than the father. This was not the custom of either the Arabs or the Hebrews, but it was of the Greeks and Romans. The Galatians, wherever they lived, would, as a non-Semitic race, probably also have had the same custom.

which is Agar] 'Hagar,' R.V.

(*a*) It is probable that in this passage 'which' is merely explanatory as in Lk. ii. 4, viii. 26, ix. 30, xii. 1; Ac. xvi. 12.

(*b*) The usual explanation is 'inasmuch as it is Hagar.' The first covenant bears children to bondage, and therefore fairly corresponds to Hagar.

25. *For* this *Agar* ('Hagar,' R.V.) *is mount Sinai in Arabia*]

(1) So the best text, which we shall consider first.

(*a*) This has been explained since the time of Chrysostom by saying that the word 'Hagar' means Mt Sinai on the lips of Arabians. For 'hagar' (חגר) in Arabic=rock, stone. But Hagar (הגר) is from a different root.

(*b*) It is therefore better to accept the following explanation. The thought 'Hagar' (not the word and not the woman as such, but the thought of bondage suggested by her) corresponds to Mt Sinai, situated in a desert land and far away from the land of promise generally, and Jerusalem in particular. No doubt the connexion of 'Hagar' with Mt Sinai would the more readily suggest itself in that Hagar and her son went into Arabia. It is doubtful whether the Hagarenes (Ps. lxxxiii. 6), or Hagrites (1 Chr. v. 10, 19, 20), were of Aramaean or Arabian origin.

The R.V. marg. has 'Many ancient authorities read *For Sinai is a mountain in Arabia.*' In the Greek this reading differs from the other only by the absence of three letters. It must be explained on the same lines as (1) (*b*). I say Hagar is the mother of slaves, for Mt Sinai, the place whence the first covenant (Hagar) came, is in a desert place far away from the land of promise generally, and Jerusalem in particular.

On Arabia see i. 17, where, as here, the distance from Jerusalem, and,

Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children.
26 But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of

also apparently, its non-Jewish associations, are in St Paul's mind. See also Appendix, Note A.

and answereth‡] 'is in the same rank with,' i.e. the same category. The Greek word is used of soldiers in the ranks, also more generally of terms belonging to the same class. A more simple form of the word is translated 'walk' in v. 25, vi. 16. 'The place of the giving of the Law belongs to the same grade or stratum of the development of the world as the present Jerusalem, the metropolis of the Jews, and not to the higher grade, on which stands the future Jerusalem, the Jerusalem that now exists in heaven' (Zahn, p. 236). The force of the 'and' is: But *though distant* it corresponds in character with etc.

Jerusalem which now is] The earthly and visible, not without reference to the position of enmity towards Christ taken by its representatives. In this and the following verse the Hebrew form of the name is used (see i. 17 note) because of its sacred and theological associations.

and is ('for she is,' R.V.) *in bondage*] Although in strict grammar the subject is Hagar or the first 'disposition,' yet, as neither could be said to be in bondage, the thought is of Jerusalem, subservient to Rome, typical of worse bondage under the Law, and indeed to an evil master (cf. John viii. 31—35).

with her children] i.e. with those who belong spiritually to her.

26. *But*] Instead of speaking now directly of the second covenant (*v.* 24), St Paul takes up the contrast to the present Jerusalem, and speaks of the Jerusalem above to which the members under the second covenant belong.

Jerusalem which is above] On Apoc. xxi. 2 Dr Swete gives many references illustrating the belief in the celestial city, e.g. *Apoc. Baruch* iv. 2 ff. (Ed. Charles, pp. 6 ff.): 'Dost thou think that this is that city of which I said: "On the palms of My hands have I graven thee"? It is not this building which is now built in your midst; it is that which will be revealed with Me, that which was prepared beforehand here from the time when I took counsel to make Paradise...and now, behold, it is preserved with Me.' The expression is common in the Rabbinic writings, e.g. T. B. *Chagigah*, 12^{b}. To the earthly Jerusalem corresponds the entirely heavenly and spiritual Jerusalem, and to this believers belong; cf. Phil. iii. 20.

which] Probably in the same loose sense as in *v.* 24; see note there. Otherwise, free in that she answers to the freedom which we her children possess.

is the mother of us all] R.V. simply 'which is our mother,' with the best authorities. The A.V. spoils the thought. For it suggests that the Jerusalem above is the mother of all whatever the nationality, whereas St Paul meant to emphasize the thought that it is the mother of us Christians, those who are under the second covenant only.

us all. For it is written, Rejoice, *thou* barren that 27
bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest
not: for the desolate hath many moe children than
she which hath a husband. Now we, brethren, as 28
Isaac was, are the children of promise. But as then he 29
that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was *born*

27. *For it is written*] I say that not the visible, but the invisible Jerusalem is our mother, for this stands prophesied of her, in Isa. liv. 1. The quotation is taken verbally from the LXX., which represents the Hebrew accurately, save that for 'break forth' the latter has 'break forth into singing.' The prophet is speaking of the greater population etc. of the restored Zion than of the earlier. It is to have the experience of Sarah, to possess a progeny far greater than that of Hagar (with a silent reference to Gen. xvi. 2—4). The prophet refers however to Zion in words transcending the fulfilment in the return from Babylon. Thus St Paul's quotation is more than a play on words; it gives the essential part of the original meaning, that there is to be a Jerusalem other than that which we now see, and that the number of its children is to be far greater.

28. Having shown in *vv.* 23—27 that we as believers are like Isaac, children of the free woman, indeed the Jerusalem above, St Paul in this one verse recalls the fact that we, also like Isaac, have our origin in promise, a subject already discussed at length in iii. 16—29.

Now we] The R.V. marg. says, 'Many ancient authorities read *ye*,' but the ordinary reading is better. 'We,' emphatic as in *v.* 26.

brethren] i. 11. St Paul gladly returns to this term of faith in their real and present standing. There can hardly be any thought in the word of all believers, you Gentiles and we Jews, being brothers as sons of one mother, as Zahn suggests (p. 241).

as Isaac was] Literally, after the category of Isaac; cf. Heb. v. 6, vii. 11.

are the (omit R.V.) *children of promise*] Rom. ix. 8. We are not dependent on the Law, but on God's promise, iii. 22.

29. *But*] In contrast to what we might have expected as God's chosen. Why wonder at persecution? Isaac had to bear it at Ishmael's hands. It should be observed that by this further evidence of the applicability of the narrative to present circumstances St Paul justifies afresh his interpretation of the identification of Isaac with believers, and Ishmael with unbelieving Jews.

he that was born after the flesh] Cf. *v.* 23.

persecuted] i.e. used to persecute, in those far-off days. The word but slightly exaggerates the meaning of the Hebrew *tzahaq*, 'mocking.' An old Rabbinic exposition (A.D. 90—120, in *Gen. R.* Parasha LIII. on Gen. xxi. 9) says that Ishmael pretended to play, but shot at Isaac with a bow and arrow, really intending to kill him; illustrating this meaning of *tzahaq* from the similar word *sahaq* in 2 Sam. ii. 14 (see Zahn).

30 after the Spirit, even so *it is* now. Nevertheless what saith
the scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son:
for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with
31 the son of the freewoman. So then, brethren, we are not
children of *the* bondwoman, but of the free.

him that was born *after the Spirit*] For the special help of God is implied in the circumstances of Isaac's birth; cf. Rom. iv. 17—21.

30. *Nevertheless*] The Greek word is the same as that of 'but' in the preceding verse. In contrast to the domineering action of Ishmael, and the present circumstances of believers in the world.

what saith the scripture] The question makes the contrast all the sharper. On 'the scripture' see iii. 8 note.

Cast out, *etc.*] Sarah's words in Gen. xxi. 10, verbally from the LXX. which = Hebr. The quotation serves at once as an encouragement to faith in the future (the persecution shall not continue), and a peremptory summons to the Galatians to set themselves free from the domineering attitude of the false teachers. For this use of the word translated 'cast out,' Moulton and Milligan compare 3 John 10 and a marriage contract of the time of Augustus, where a man is bound over not to ill-treat his wife, 'nor to divorce her' (*Expositor*, VII. 7, 1909, p. 89).

shall not be heir] The double thought of both promise and command is carried on; cf. Moulton, *Proleg.* 1906, p. 177.

of the freewoman] St Paul's explanatory substitute for 'my (son) Isaac'; necessary, as the words are put into the mouth of 'the scripture.'

31. *So then*] 'Wherefore,' R.V. The Greek particle employed is used always of practical result rather than argumentative inference; a deduction from the preceding *vv.* 21—30, which must be carried out in daily life (thus forming the transition to the next section); we are therefore free.

brethren] Once more; see *v.* 28 note.

the *bondwoman*] No article; a mere servant (*v.* 22 note). 'A mere bondmaid.'

the free] The absence of the article before 'bondwoman,' and its insertion here, rhetorically direct attention (see Milligan on 1 Thess. iv. 8) and also suggest the unique character of the Jerusalem above. This is our true and proper position, to be and behave as—children of the free!

CHAPTER V.

1. *Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free*]

I. In this verse St Paul clinches the argument of iv. 21—31 with a summary statement of doctrine, and a practical application. For,

Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath 5
made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke

whatever the precise reading may be, the repetition of the catchword 'freedom,' and of 'us' (which carries on the idea of 'children of the freewoman') determines the connexion of the thought of the verse with the preceding passage rather than the following.

II. The Greek text is not quite certain, the variations being chiefly the position of 'therefore' and the presence or absence of the relative translated 'wherewith.' On the whole it is best to read 'therefore' late in the verse, and to omit the relative. We thus get the translation of the R.V. 'with ("for," R.V. marg.) freedom did Christ set us free: stand fast therefore.' Even so there is some doubt about the meaning. (*a*) Lightfoot (who however adds the relative) joins 'with freedom... free' to iv. 31, and so Geneva (1557), 'of the free woman, by that libertie wherwith Christ hath delivered us,' but the sentence becomes very clumsy. (*b*) It can hardly be the Hellenistic method of expressing the emphatic 'infinitive absolute' of the Hebrew with a finite verb (Luke xxii. 15), i.e. 'Christ completely freed us,' for both the position of the words and the presence of the article forbid this. (*c*) Probably the R.V. marg. is best, 'For freedom.' This would express what Hort thinks was the original reading of the Greek, a preposition *expressed* before 'freedom,' as in *v.* 13.

Christ hath made us free] So Rom. viii. 2. St Paul has not yet said in this Epistle that Christ set us free, though the thought is contained in iii. 25, iv. 2. Compare the prayer of Jonathan and the priests in 2 Mac. i. 27, 'Gather together our Dispersion, set at liberty them that are in bondage among the heathen.' See the note on 'redeem,' iv. 5.

entangled] A.V. and R.V., but this is to introduce the notion of a net, or at least a cord tied several times, which is neither in this nor the preceding Greek words. You are in danger of being held in, fastened and restrained, by the yoke. So Rheims rightly, 'be not holden in againe with the yoke of servitude.' In 2 Tim. ii. 4 another word is employed. Compare 3 Mac. vi. 10, 'if our life in our exile has been involved in iniquity.'

again] After your past experience (iv. 9)!

with the yoke of bondage] As 'yoke' is defined by 'bondage' the idiomatic English translation of the Greek is doubtless 'the yoke of bondage,' not 'a yoke,' R.V. For both the words and the thought in physical bondage see 1 Tim. vi. 1, the only other passage where 'yoke' (as a substantive) is found in St Paul's writings. Compare too Ac. xv. 10. Luther, perhaps not unfairly, draws out the metaphor to a point beyond St Paul's, 'For like as oxen do draw in the yoke with great toil, receive nothing thereby but forage and pasture, and, when they be able to draw the yoke no more, are appointed to the slaughter: even so they that seek righteousness by the law, are captives and oppressed with the yoke of bondage, that is to say, with the law: and when they have tired themselves a long time in the works of the law with great and grievous

2 of bondage. Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be
3 circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify

toil, in the end this is their reward, that they are miserable and perpetual servants.'

2—12. *Another, but sharper, appeal and warning. The observance of the Law is inconsistent with faith in Christ.*

2—6. *The effect of circumcision and of faith contrasted.*

(*v.* 2) See! I, I Paul (accused of preaching circumcision, *v.* 11) say to you that, so far from circumcision being necessary, if you are circumcised Christ will not profit you at all. (*v.* 3) On the contrary I protest again to every man undergoing circumcision that he is then debtor to do the whole Law—circumcision is the very seal of his debt. (*v.* 4) You then and there became paralysed, losing all connexion with Christ, as many of you as wish to be justified in the Law; you then and there fell away from the grace of God. (*v.* 5) For, in contrast, we true believers, by the spirit, not the flesh, taking our start from faith wait for the hope set before us, full righteousness. (*v.* 6) For in Christ Jesus (as we are) externalities are powerless. Faith alone is effective, made operative by God by means of love to Him and men.

2. *Behold*] The exact form of this interjection in Greek is found here only in St Paul's writings.

I Paul] 2 Cor. x. 1; Eph. iii. 1; Col. i. 23; 1 Thess. ii. 18; Phm. 19†. Emphatic: I who, they say, preach circumcision (*v.* 11). There can hardly be any reference to his commission, i. 1.

if ye be circumcised] 'if ye receive circumcision,' R.V., i.e. 'if ye suffer yourselves to be circumcised' (Lightfoot). Circumcision is much worse than the isolated acts of iv. 10. It is possible that the false teachers may have represented circumcision as desirable (see iii. 3 note) though not essential (compare Ananias' advice to Izates, king of Adiabene, Josephus, *Ant.* xx. 2. 4 [§§ 41 sq.]), but St Paul's language and thought are in such precise opposition to Ac. xv. 1 that in all probability they insisted on circumcision as necessary. In the case of the later false teachers at Colossae it was otherwise.

Christ shall profit you nothing] 'will be of no advantage to you.' For the thought see ii. 21; for the word, Rom. ii. 25. The future of result (Ell.), hardly referring to the Parousia, *v.* 5. St Paul means that Christ is of advantage only to him who trusts exclusively to Him; not to him who 'trusts neither Christ nor the Law, but stands between, wishing to gain from either side' (Chrys.).

3. *vv.* 3, 4 are at once a solemn reiteration of the truth stated in *v.* 2, and an explanation of it.

For] 'Yea,' R.V. The word suggests a contrast to 'shall profit.' So far from receiving advantage from Christ you will fall under obligation to the Law.

I testify] Better, 'I protest,' strengthening the preceding 'I say,' very nearly as in Eph. iv. 17. On 'protest' see Milligan, 1 Th. ii. 12.

again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law. Christ is become of no effect unto 4 you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen

again] Referring to *v.* 2, the first 'you' of which is expanded to 'every man.' It can hardly refer to the last occasion when he was with them.

every man] Col. i. 28. Perhaps suggesting the superior station etc. of some who were being led astray; cf. *v.* 10.

that is circumcised] 'that receiveth circumcision,' R.V.; cf. vi. 13. The present suggests a process in mind and act, still uncompleted. The Apostle will wean the man from it.

a debtor] Elsewhere in St Paul's Epp. only Rom. i. 14, viii. 12, xv. 27. The circumcised man pledges himself to keep the whole Law; which, as we all know, he cannot do. He loses Christ and does not even gain the blessings of the Law. Further, if the Galatians had received teaching similar to that recorded for us in the First Gospel, the word 'debtor' would have a very serious connotation for them, Mt. vi. 12, xviii. 24.

the whole law] Jas. ii. 10. No doubt the Gentile Galatian Christians did not realize all that circumcision would mean to them now.

4. St Paul's object here is partly to explain *v.* 2 further, and partly to turn them from their mistaken purpose by the sharpness of his language.

Christ is become of no effect unto you] 'Ye are severed from Christ,' R.V. The word translated 'severed' is the same as that translated 'ceased' or 'done away' in *v.* 11, and 'make of none effect' in iii. 17. St Paul could hardly have employed a stronger word. They would have existence, but existence that is useless. On the difficulty of translating the word in question see Sanday-Headlam, Rom. vii. 6, where they paraphrase 'we were struck with atrophy.'

are justified] 'would be justified,' R.V.

by the law] ii. 16 note.

ye are fallen] 'away,' R.V. Figurative as in 2 Pet. iii. 17. Compare Ecclus. xxxi. (xxxiv.) 7, 'dreams have led many astray, and men have failed (literally "fallen away") by putting their hope in them,' where unfortunately the Hebrew is not extant; also Plato, *Repub.* VI. 496 C, 'fall away from philosophy.'

Lightfoot suggests that it='were driven forth,' as the correlative of 'cast out,' iv. 30, quoting Thuc. VI. 4 where the two words occur. But the words are so far apart in our Epistle that the correlation is forced. The tense of 'severed' and 'fallen away' is not the perfect but the aorist, and was probably chosen for vividness, suggesting both the completeness and the immediateness of the effect of seeking to be justified elsewhere than in Christ.

5 from grace. For we through the Spirit wait for the hope of
6 righteousness by faith. For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any *thing*, nor uncircumcision; but faith

grace] The article in the Greek is hardly generic, but rather the grace given by God (i. 15, ii. 21), and received by you. Compare Rom. v. 2.

5. The contrast of St Paul and those who acted as he.

For we (true believers, iv. 26, 28) *through the Spirit*] In the Greek there is no article (as in *vv.* 16, 18, 25). We must translate it 'by the spirit,' but the connotation is probably not the Holy Spirit as a Person but rather that higher mode of action which is 'spirit' not 'flesh.' See Appendix, Note F.

wait for] Rom. viii. 19, 23.

the hope of righteousness] Gen. of apposition epexegetic of 'hope.' Perfect and personal righteousness is regarded as the objective hope set before the Christian; cf. Col. i. 5. The insertion of 'hope' suggests the need of continuance in the service of Christ. There is a sense in which righteousness is given to the believer at once (Rom. ix. 30), but its complete possession will not take place until the Parousia. So we hope for 'the adoption of sons,' Rom. viii. 23, though in a sense already received (*supra* iii. 26, iv. 5). Compare 'the hope of salvation,' 1 Th. v. 8.

by faith] ii. 16. To avoid all ambiguity these words rightly precede 'wait' in the R.V.

6. *For*] Explaining St Paul's reliance on 'Spirit' and especially 'by faith.'

in Jesus Christ] 'in Christ Jesus,' R.V. So ii. 4, iii. 26, 28; cf. iii. 14. St Paul adds the dear personal name which recalls His life, death, and whole work of salvation. *In Christ Jesus.* Out of Christ they might avail something, but to a man who is *in* Christ they effect nothing. For the continuance and attainment of final righteousness the exercise of faith is necessary. Observe that St Paul is not speaking of how to become 'in Christ,' but how to live when in Him. Thus the passage has no relation to the Roman Catholic doctrine of *fides formata* as necessary for justification in the forensic sense.

neither, etc.] vi. 15. Similarly it is not the colour of the soldier that makes the difference, but his skill in fighting (Theodoret after Chrysostom).

circumcision...uncircumcision] i.e. as such, vi. 15 note. On the contrary, either may be of grievous hindrance if entered upon with a view to salvation thereby.

availeth any thing] Cf. Jas. v. 16; Mt. v. 13. If a man is in Christ the only thing that avails for Christian activity etc. is faith made operative by love. Moulton and Milligan understand the Greek word to mean 'is valid,' as in Heb. ix. 17, comparing a passage in a papyrus of the 2nd cent. A.D. (*Expositor*, VII. 7, May 1909, p. 475).

which worketh by love. Ye did run well; [1]who did hinder 7
you that *ye* should not obey the truth? *This* persuasion 8

[1] Or, *who did drive you back?*

which worketh] 'working,' R.V., but 'wrought,' R.V. marg., better, 'being made operative.' Passive, and probably suggesting Divine action brought to bear upon faith (Col. i. 29 notes in C.G.T.). Thus in the true Christian life faith is wrought upon by God, who, using the means of our love to Himself and men, brings out our faith to its true productiveness.

by ('through,' R.V.) *love*] Love, in its widest sense. St Paul is approaching the moral teaching of *vv.* 13 sqq. (Beet). Observe 'Cum *fide* conjunxit spem *v.* 5, nunc *amorem*. In his stat novus Christianus' (Bengel). Chrysostom, perhaps rightly, sees here a hint to the Galatians that if their love to Christ had been right they would not have deserted Him for bondage.

7—12. *Against continuing in retrogression; with sharp words against the leader and the false teachers generally.*

(*v.* 7) You were running your race nobly; who hindered you, so that (to drop all metaphor) you should not obey truth? (*v.* 8) This persuasion of yours is not from Him whose voice you once heard and can still hear. (*v.* 9) Do not despise beginnings in evil. You know the proverb, A little leaven etc. (*v.* 10) I, for my part, still have confidence in you in the Lord that you will not set your heart on any other than the one way and truth, but the leader of those who trouble you shall bear the burden of his judgment, whatever his present position. (*v.* 11) I have spoken of myself, now I speak of myself again in contrast to him. I at any rate, my brothers, whatever may be said of me, am different from what I was before my conversion, and I have made no change since. The evidence that I do not now, as once, preach circumcision is that I am still persecuted. For the cross has not lost its effect of being a stumbling-block! (*v.* 12) I wish that those who so upset you would, while they are about it, make themselves altogether eunuchs!

7. *Ye did run* ('Ye were running,' R.V.) *well*] i.e. finely.

who] Contemptuous. No one had the right to do so, iii. 1; cf. Rom. xiv. 4; Jas. iv. 12.

did hinder] The metaphor of the race is continued. Who made your way impassable? The Greek verb was used originally of cutting into a road, breaking it up (not, as it seems, of cutting obstacles down into it), but 'it came to mean "hinder" generally,' Milligan on 1 Th. ii. 18.

obey (Rom. ii. 8) *the truth*] No article; 'truth' as such, 2 Th. ii. 13. St Paul here exchanges the figure of a race for the reality of his subject.

The Great Bible (1539) with a few late MSS. adds 'consent unto no man,' and similarly Wyclif. Zahn rather strangely accepts this clause as genuine and joins it to the preceding words: 'Listen to no one that ye

9 *cometh* not of him that calleth you. A little leaven leaveneth
10 the whole lump. I have confidence in you through the Lord, that you will be none otherwise minded: but he that troubleth you shall bear *his* judgment, whosoever he be.

should not listen to truth' ('Solchem, was Wahrheit ist, nicht zu gehorchen, (darin) gehorchet niemandem').

8. This *persuasion*‡] The Greek word is rare, and in Ignat. Rom. iii., Justin, *Apol.* I. 53. 1 its meaning ambiguous. But in Iren. IV. 33. 7 it is plainly passive. So probably here 'This persuasion that you have.'

cometh ('came,' R.V.) *not of him that calleth you*] You have been over-persuaded, but this has been due to merely human art (cf. 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5); it has not come from Him whose voice you heard at first, i. 6. Yet 'calleth' is not quite timeless; it rather suggests the continuous call of the living God. Yet see Milligan on 1 Thess. ii. 12.

9. *A little leaven, etc.*] Despise not the beginning of evil. I grieve not only for what is but for what will be (cf. Theodore, Chrys.). The proverb is general, but to the Jewish mind leaven would suggest at once that which might not be offered to God. The leaven here is the false doctrine which seemed so slight and harmless (cf. *vv.* 2, 3 notes), not the false teacher (*v.* 7) regarded as one in contrast to many. For this has no point here. In 1 Cor. v. 6 it is otherwise; the sin of one individual spoils the whole body of Christians at Corinth.

10. *I*] The absence of a conjunction increases the emphasis on both the personality and the assurance. St Paul sets himself over against the 'who' of *v.* 7.

have confidence] The Greek verb has the same root as that of 'obey' (*v.* 7), 'persuasion' (*v.* 8), on which St Paul thus harps.

through ('in,' R.V.) *the Lord*] In whom St Paul finds all his confidence for both his own actions (Phil. ii. 24) and those of others (2 Thess. iii. 4).

otherwise...troubleth] The conjunction of the two words 'other' and 'troubleth' makes it probable that St Paul's thought is similar to that of i. 7. He does not mean, that is to say, that they will hold the truths expressed in *vv.* 8, 9, but the main truth of the Gospel, in which they once ran well (*v.* 7).

minded] = the set purpose of your mind and heart, Col. iii. 2. In Phil. iii. 15 it refers only to details, not the essence of the faith.

but he that troubleth] i. 7 note. Even though you are not permanently injured. The singular is perhaps generic, 'everyone who' etc.: but probably is used because St Paul had one man of the 'some' (i. 7) specially in his mind.

shall bear] The first occurrence of a word which is found no less than three times in the sixth chapter. St Paul employs it elsewhere only twice in Rom. The only Biblical parallel to its connexion with 'judgment' is in 2 K. xviii. 14, 'that which thou puttest upon me I will

And I, brethren, if I yet preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution? then is the offence of the cross ceased. 11
I would they were even cut off which trouble you. 12

bear.' The judgment is thought of as a load carried away from the judgment seat (cf. Meyer).

whosoever he be] Otiose if St Paul was not thinking of some one person. He was a man of reputation, which was originally (doubtless) well deserved.

11. *And* ('But,' R.V.) *I*] Primarily in contrast to the change, probably made and certainly taught, by the false leader. I, in contrast to him, and also to what is said of me by him and others like him, am different from what I was as a Jew before my conversion, and remain different. I at any rate have made no change since my conversion. The causes of such an accusation may have been (*a*) his circumcision of Timothy, Ac. xvi. 3; (*b*) his permission, or instruction, to Jewish parents to circumcise their children, for the accusation in Ac. xxi. 21 is evidently false; (*c*) his indifference to circumcision as such in the case of Jews, 1 Cor. vii. 18; (*d*) perhaps also his recent dissemination of the decree of the Council of Jerusalem.

brethren] iv. 28 note.

yet...yet] The first 'yet' is continuous from before his conversion; the second from after his conversion, i.e. temporal not logical.

then] The conclusion is logical (ii. 21) if the premisses are granted. But the supposition that he still preaches circumcision is so plainly false, and it is so evident that he is still persecuted, that the sentence becomes satirical.

is the offence] 'stumblingblock,' R.V. The figure is suggested by Isa. viii. 14 (cf. xxviii. 16), where the full revelation of God (which is Christ) is termed a stone of stumbling, for the revelation culminates in the Cross; see Rom. ix. 33; 1 Pet. ii. 8 (where see Hort); 1 Cor. i. 23.

of the cross] vi. 12, 14; Col. i. 20; cf. iii. 1; Phil. iii. 18.

ceased] 'hath...been done away,' R.V. *v.* 4 note.

12. *I would they were even cut off*] Better, with R.V. marg.: 'even mutilate themselves,' i.e. make themselves eunuchs. So Deut. xxiii. 1 (2). St Paul vividly, if somewhat coarsely, contrasts partial with complete mutilation, the latter being 'a recognized form of heathen self-devotion' (Lightfoot). The metaphorical meaning of excision from the Church, though more in accordance with our modern notions of delicacy of expression, is contrary to the unanimous opinion of the Greek commentators.

which trouble you] 'unsettle,' R.V. A different word from that of *v.* 10. It means 'who throw you into confusion.' Dan. (LXX.) vii. 23; Ac. xvii. 6, xxi. 38‡; also some six times in the Hexapla. In the well known naughty boy's letter to his father (ii.—iii. cents. A.D.) he writes, 'My mother said to Archelaus, "He quite upsets me! off with him"' (see e.g. Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 133; E.T. p. 188; or Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, VII. 5, p. 269, 1908).

13 For, brethren, ye have been called unto liberty; only *use* not liberty for an occasion to the flesh, but by love serve

13—vi. 10. PRACTICAL. LIBERTY IS NOT LICENSE BUT SERVICE; NOT THE FLESH BUT THE SPIRIT MUST BE THE AIM OF THE BELIEVER.

13—15. *I say, you were called for freedom. But do not forget that true freedom implies service to others.*

(*v.* 13) I speak so strongly about those that are confounding you, for *you* were called on the basis of freedom, my brothers. Only do not hold your freedom for an occasion to the flesh, but by your love be slaves to one another. (*v.* 14) For the whole Law (which you desire to be under) has found its completion in one saying, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' (*v.* 15) But if you forget this and fight each other like wild beasts, beware lest the whole community of you perish.

13. *For, brethren, ye*] St Paul takes up the 'you' of *v.* 12 and defends his wish that the false teachers would so act that their real character would be seen. For you (emphatic) were not meant to do as they desire. You were called on the footing of freedom. He thus returns to *v.* 1, but, in accordance with his custom, finds his *point d'appui* in the immediately preceding verse.

It is probable that in this and the succeeding verses, besides St Paul's primary desire to remind his readers of their practical duty, he intended also to enter a caveat against the hostile interpretation of his teaching of grace, that it meant freedom from the restrictions of the Law and therefore license to sin (Rom. vi. 1 sqq.).

have been called (i. 6, 15, *v.* 8) *unto liberty*] 'were called for freedom,' R.V. For 'for freedom' compare the note on 'redeem,' iv. 5. Ramsay (*Gal.* pp. 442 sqq.) calls attention to the numerical preponderance of words expressing 'liberty,' 'freedom' in this Epistle, and suggests that this is due to St Paul's desire to stir up the idea of individual freedom, which was weak in South Galatia (Phrygia) though strong in Asia and Achaia. Yet if St Paul was writing to the N. Galatians, with whom the idea of political and personal freedom was, presumably, strong, he might well appeal to this feeling, from the sense that liberty in Christ is at once the germ and the crowning fruit of all.

only use *not liberty*] 'your freedom,' R.V. For the thought compare Aristides quoted by Wetstein. 'It is more profitable to be a slave than to use your liberty as an occasion of evil.' The article may be generic, but is probably personal, 'your liberty.'

for an occasion] 1 Tim. v. 14. The Greek word means properly a base of operations in war, thence a pretext, occasion.

by love] Better, 'by *your* love' serve. Col. iii. 24; cf. 1 Pet. ii. 16. Here not without reference to its usage already in this Epistle: you had experience of wrong service (iv. 8) to which you are wishing to go back (iv. 9), although Jerusalem (your would-be standard in religion) is in bondage (iv. 25); now be in what is true service, to one another and thus (*v.* 14) to the Law.

one another. For all the law is fulfilled in one word, *even* in 14
this; Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. But 15
if ye bite and devour one another, take heed ye be not

one another] After touching on this here and in the two following verses he returns to it at greater length in *v.* 26—vi. 6.

14. *For all the law*] 'the whole law,' R.V., placing more emphasis on the unity of the Law. 'For' justifies service to one another. This is the real fulfilment of the Law, which you have been wanting to serve.

is fulfilled] Not (1) 'is summed up,' 'comprehended' (cf. Rom. xiii. 9 another word), for which there is no parallel in St Paul's writings, or, strictly, anywhere in the N.T.; but (2) 'has been brought to perfection, has found its completion, in one saying.' So 'fulfil' frequently in the Gospels; cf. Col. i. 25 note. Observe the high ethical purpose that St Paul attributes to the whole Law, ceremonial as well as moral (for he was dealing with the question of circumcision); it finds its truest utterance, its fullest statement, in Thou shalt love etc.

(3) Possibly, however, St Paul means 'is summarily fulfilled (i.e. performed) in the observance of one saying.' If so, then in Rom. xiii. 8, written very soon after our Epistle, he makes his meaning clearer by altering the form of his sentence to 'he that loveth his neighbour hath fulfilled the Law.' But in our Epistle the perfect passive of the Greek word will then rhetorically represent the future perfect, and it is doubtful if there are any satisfactory parallels to this usage of the perfect passive absolutely (Rom. iv. 14, xiv. 23, are the nearest) without an hypothesis preceding.

in one word] i.e. 'in one saying,' not 'in the performance of one saying.' Instead of this Marcion reads 'in you.' Both readings are found in a few 'Western' authorities.

Thou shalt love, *etc.*] Lev. xix. 18 *b*. Quoted also in the similar context of Rom. xiii. 9. So also Jas. ii. 8; cf. Mt. vii. 12. A Rabbi quoted in Biesenthal's Hebrew Commentary on Romans xiii. 9 calls this text 'the foot on which the whole Law (the 613 commandments) stands,' referring to the story of Hillel teaching the enquirer while he stood on one foot. Observe that though St Paul quotes only these words, he expects *more Rabbinico* that his readers will bear in mind the context. For Lev. xix. 17, 18 *a* warn against cherishing evil in one's heart, and taking vengeance against one's neighbour. Originally the passage referred to the treatment of Israelites only; Christian teaching enlarges it to the true Israel and to all men.

15. *But if ye bite† and devour one another*] A glimpse of the strife engendered through the false teaching. You are like beasts or dogs when being fed.

take heed ye be not consumed] Lk. ix. 54† (2 Th. ii. 8 *var. lect.*), and your organic life as a community perish.

16—24. *The nature, outcome, and means of liberty in daily life.*

(*v.* 16) In contrast to such disputes, which are the visible signs of lives lived by the flesh, walk by the spirit and you will not finish the

16 consumed one of another. *This* I say then, Walk in the
17 Spirit, and [1]ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh. For the flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the

[1] Or, *fulfil not.*

lust of the flesh. (*v.* 17) For though the flesh lusts against the spirit, the spirit also lusts against the flesh (for they are mutually antagonistic) in order that ye may not do your evil desires. (*v.* 18) So far is it from this that if you are led by the spirit you are not under even the Law, in which the flesh and sin have found their strength. (*v.* 19) In contrast to such a holy life, you can see round you the many works of the flesh, such as first, those of immorality, (*v.* 20) and the worship of false gods and traffic in magic arts; secondly, those which are connected with personal ambition and party spirit, (*v.* 21) and envyings; thirdly, with those of social, or perhaps religious, festivities; and such like things; with respect to which I warn you now before any commit them, as I said when I was with you, that they who practise such things will not inherit God's kingdom. (*v.* 22) But the spirit produces by, as I may say, a natural growth, graces all connected, affecting the heart, character, and outward behaviour. (*v.* 23) No Law can prevent virtues of this kind. (*v.* 24) So far from it being able to do so, they who belong to Christ Jesus have put to death on His cross the flesh with its passions and its lusts.

16. This *I say then*] 'But I say,' R.V. iv. 1 note. The 'but' primarily, after St Paul's manner, expresses a contrast to the immediately preceding description of disputes, but the chief motive of the following passage is to explain what is meant by liberty (*v.* 13) in daily life, and how it is to be attained.

Walk] 'Walk' in this metaphorical sense seems not to be found outside Greek affected by Semitic thought; see Col. i. 10 note in C.G.T.

in ('by,' R.V.) *the Spirit*] Dat. of norm; *v.* 25, vi. 16. Spirit as such with no immediate reference to the Third Person of the Holy Trinity. See Appendix, Note F.

ye shall not fulfil] Better, 'accomplish,' a different word from that in *v.* 14; observe that the clause expresses the result, and is not a command, 'bring to its legitimate end,' 2 Tim. iv. 7; cf. Jas. i. 15.

the lust] Col. iii. 5; cf. *v.* 24. Although there is no article in the Greek the word is defined by the following substantive.

of the flesh] iii. 3.

17. *For the flesh*] 'For' introduces the reason for the triumph over the flesh (*v.* 16): the flesh lusts against the spirit, but, thank God, the reverse is also true! The verse is a very brief summary of the experience described in Rom. vii. 17—25. By 'the flesh' St Paul here means the propensity to evil, which makes itself felt through the physical nature.

lusteth] In this clause with a bad connotation, but in the next it is not only understood but understood in a good sense. Cf. of Christ,

flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other: so that ye cannot do the *things* that ye would. But if ye 18

Luke xxii. 15; of angels, 1 Pet. i. 12. The opposition between flesh and spirit lies not only in act but primarily in aim and desire.

against the Spirit] The article is generic as with 'the flesh.' There is no more thought of the Holy Ghost than in *v.* 16.

and the Spirit against the flesh] In glad contrast to the preceding clause.

and ('for,' R.V. with the best authorities) *these are contrary the one to the other*] Probably a parenthesis; see below: 'for' gives the reason for the activity of the contradictory desires of the flesh and the spirit. It lies in the fundamental enmity that they have to each other. 'Are contrary,' literally 'are adversaries,' which is stronger. Cf. the participle 1 Cor. xvi. 9; Phil. i. 28; 2 Th. ii. 4; 1 Tim. v. 14; cf. Job xiii. 25; Zech. iii. 1. See Augustine's fine remarks in his *Confessions* VIII. 5 and 9.

so that ye cannot] 'in order that ye may not,' and so R.V. To be taken closely with 'and the Spirit against the flesh.' See below for the interpretation 'so that.'

do the things *that ye would*] 'would,' i.e. desire, in accordance with the evil promptings of the flesh.

There are, however, two other ways of understanding this verse which are worthy of mention.

(1) Taking 'these are contrary the one to the other' not as a parenthesis, but closely with the following clause, and giving 'would' the widest possible meaning: 'For these are adversaries to each other in order that ye may not do what ye wish, whether good or ill,' with no doubt special thought of ill. But the Apostle would not take much interest in the fact that the flesh hinders the wish for good things without saying more about it. We should expect, if this interpretation were right, to see a further remark about the difficulty of doing right.

Deissmann (*Licht vom Osten*, p. 235; E.T. pp. 328 sq.) illustrates this passage from words frequently found in the manumission of slaves 'doing what he will,' and thinks that St Paul here has such a clause in mind when he warns us against returning to slavery under the Law (cf. *v.* 18).

(2) With the rendering 'so that ye cannot do the things that ye would,' A.V. In this case it may be

(*a*) Still a summons to holiness; so Theodore of Mopsuestia, 'neither is it possible for us to do what we will, for we who exist in the things of the future life cannot practise the things of mortality.' Compare also his words on *v.* 25, 'so that neither passion nor concupiscence can find any place in us. For we have passed over into that future life by the regeneration of the Spirit.'

(*b*) A palliative against despair at failure, 'the things that ye would' being good things. But this, perhaps the usual interpretation among English readers, is quite out of accord with the confident note of the whole passage. Luther feels this and has to add a summons to courage: 'When I was a monk, I thought by and by that I was utterly

19 be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law. Now the works of the flesh are manifest, which are *these;* Adultery,

cast away, if at any time I felt the lust of the flesh: I should not have so miserably tormented myself, but should have thought and said to myself as now commonly I do: Martin, thou shalt not utterly be without sin, for thou hast flesh: thou shalt therefore feel the battle thereof: according to that saying of Paul: The flesh resisteth the Spirit. Despair not therefore, but resist it strongly, and fulfil not the lust thereof. Thus doing thou art not under the law' (p. 262 *ab*).

18. *But if ye be led of the Spirit, ye are not under the law*] The contrast is to the possibility implied in *vv.* 16, 17 of listening to and carrying out the lust of the flesh. If you are led by the spirit you are not under (shall I say the flesh? nay, I will say that which calls out the power of the flesh) the Law. St Paul thus arrives by a practical argument at the same result to which he had come by his earlier proof from the nature of God's promises, iv. 1—7. Compare Rom. viii. 1—5 and 14.

19. *Now*] In *vv.* 19—23 St Paul contrasts the signs that mark the nature of each kind of life.

'Now' either explanatory, when the contrast always underlying the Greek word is to the summary statement that precedes—I have spoken of two sets of desires; I now unfold my meaning—or primarily in direct contrast to the life led by the Spirit. This perhaps is more in accordance with St Paul's method of conducting his argument (cf. *v.* 16 note).

the works of the flesh] When the lust of the flesh is fulfilled (see *v.* 16 and cf. also Jas. i. 15). The phrase is unique. Compare 'the works of darkness,' Rom. xiii. 12; Eph. v. 11; and 'the works of the devil,' 1 John iii. 8. The contrast between 'the works' and 'the fruit,' *v.* 22, is pithily expressed by Bengel, '*Opera*, infructuosa. *Opera*, in plurali; quia divisa sunt, et saepe inter se pugnantia, et vel singula carnem produnt. At *fructus*, bonus, *v.* 22, in singulari quia conjunctus et concors. Cf. Eph. v. 11, 9.'

manifest] Open to all to see. In contrast to the 'lust' of *v.* 16. Its position is emphatic; everywhere, especially in heathen lands, it is not necessary to look for these things.

Adultery, etc.] Omitted in the R.V. with the best authorities. Ramsay, *Gal.* pp. 446 sqq., pleading for the South Galatian theory, gives a very ingenious division of the fifteen faults mentioned into 'three groups, corresponding to three different kinds of influence likely to affect recent South Galatian converts from paganism.' (1) Faults fostered by the old Anatolian religion: 'fornication, impurity, wantonness, idolatry, sorcery or magic.' (2) Faults connected with the municipal life in the cities of Asia Minor: 'enmities, strife, rivalry, outbursts of wrath, caballings, factions, parties, jealousies,' whether due to the rivalry of city against city or the result of personal or national jealousy within the cities. (3) Faults connected with the society and manners of the Graeco-Asiatic cities: 'drinkings, revellings.' The

fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witch- 20
craft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions,

division is perhaps the best that has been suggested, but the value of it as evidence for the South Galatian theory may be doubted. He shows without much difficulty that all these faults were in South Galatia, but is not so successful in his argument that they were not the faults of North Galatia also. For the first group describes sins hardly thought to be sins by any heathen; the second, sins at least as distinctive of clans and chieftains as of municipalities[1]; and the third, sins not really peculiar to Greek life.

fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness] Three forms of impurity, inclusive of but not limited to the public adoption of immorality in the temples. The first is the specific sin of fornication; the second is general; the third is open shamelessness, probably sensuality, but possibly, as Ramsay suggests, the self-mutilation of the devotees in the Phrygian Mysteries (cf. *v.* 12), which seems to have been as prevalent in North as in South Galatia.

20. *idolatry*] The connexion of immorality with heathen worship readily leads St Paul to mention this.

witchcraft] 'sorcery,' R.V. The use of drugs not as medicines but as *media* in magic; *veneficia* Vulg. So in Ex. vii. 11 al. of the 'enchantments' whereby the Egyptian magicians performed their wonders. Cf. Rev. ix. 21, xviii. 23. Lightfoot points out the 'striking coincidence, if nothing more,' that sorcery was condemned at the Council of Ancyra, the capital of North Galatia, about A.D. 314. For the connexion of such magic with idolatry see Rev. xxi. 8.

hatred] 'enmities,' R.V. Even if St Paul had the threefold grouping of these various faults in his mind (*vide supra*) 'sorcery,' as often directed against persons, would readily suggest 'enmities.' The plural of the Greek word occurs here only in the New Testament. On the ascending scale of the faults as far as 'envyings' see Lightfoot.

variance] 'strife,' R.V. Cf. 1 Cor. i. 11.

emulations] 'jealousies,' R.V. With 'strife' in Rom. xiii. 13 and, also with 'wraths,' in 2 Cor. xii. 20.

wrath] 'wraths,' R.V., a more passionate form of 'strife,' Lightfoot.

strife] not 'factions,' R.V., with the connotation of the vice of the followers of a party, but 'ambitions,' 'rivalries,' the vice of a leader of a party created for his own pride. From its connexion with 'hireling,' the Greek word acquired the meaning of bribery and winning over followers, and so of seeking followers (cf. Phil. i. 17). See Hort's important note on Jas. iii. 14.

seditions] 'divisions,' R.V. Rom. xvi. 17; 1 Mac. iii. 29‡. Not so permanent as the next word. In the parallel passage, 2 Cor. xii. 20, 'tumults.'

[1] Ramsay writes (p. 452), 'Vainglory and pride in petty distinctions was the leading motive in municipal life; the challenging of one another to competition in this foolish strife was almost the largest part of their history [i.e. the history of the Graeco-Asiatic cities] amid the peace and prosperity of the Roman rule. But that

21 heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and
such like: of the which I tell you before, as I have also told
you in time past, that they which do such *things* shall not
22 inherit the kingdom of God. But the fruit of the Spirit

heresies] A stronger word than in 1 Cor. xi. 18, 19. The word seems to denote not only external separation, cf. R.V. marg. 'parties,' but internal in aim and purpose, mind and heart. It thus readily suggests 'envyings.' A still stronger use of the same word is found in 2 Pet. ii. 1, where see Bigg's note.

21. *envyings*] The plural, 1 Pet. ii. 1†.

murders] Omitted in the R.V. with the best authorities. The sound of 'envyings' and 'murders' in the Greek is almost identical. The two words occur together in Rom. i. 29.

drunkenness] The Greek word is in the plural, as also in Rom. xiii. 13. The singular occurs in Lk. xxi. 34†.

revellings] Rom. xiii. 13; 1 Pet. iv. 3†. 'Carousals,' whether private, or, more probably, public revels connected with the worship of the gods, in particular of Bacchus. 'Even the excellent Plutarch thought that it was absurd to be squeamish over wine, and that it was not only excusable, but a religious duty, to let tongues go; the gods required this compliment to their mythological characters' (Bigg on 1 Pet. iv. 3).

and such like] Thus preventing his readers from supposing that they may go beyond the list with safety.

I tell you before] 2 Cor. xiii. 2; 1 Th. iii. 4†, i.e. hardly as R.V. marg. I tell you plainly before any commit them.

as I have also told you] i.e. as I did tell you before. Such a warning belonged to the elementary instruction of converts (1 Th. iv. 1 sqq.; 1 Cor. vi. 9 sq.; Rom. vi. 17) and may have been given on the first or the second visit. Contrast i. 9.

do] 'practise,' R.V.; cf. 2 Cor. xii. 21.

shall not inherit] Cf. Eph. v. 5.

the kingdom of God] Perhaps in silent contrast to the kingdom of Caesar, as probably 'the royal law' in Jas. ii. 8 to the same phrase used of imperial decrees: see Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 265; E.T. pp. 367 sq.

22. *But the fruit*] In contrast to 'the works,' *v.* 19, where see note. Cf. Eph. v. 9; Phil. i. 11; Jas. iii. 18; Rev. xxii. 2. The following virtues are introduced as one 'fruit,' for they stand in necessary connexion with each other. If one were to perish all would. In the LXX. version of Prov. x. 16, 'the works of the righteous produce life; but the fruits of the ungodly *produce* sins,' the writer regards the effect of each work of the righteous from a legal standpoint, and rightly attributes no unifying principle to the fruits of the ungodly.

is not the type of the North Galatian tribes: the Gaulish element was an aristocratic one, and such are not the faults of an aristocracy.' It would appear that the Professor has forgotten his Scott's novels, or does not believe in the accuracy of their description of the bickerings and jealousies of the petty aristocrats of the Highlands. This second group of faults would suit the latter admirably.

is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance: against such there is no law. 23

the Spirit] In spite of the strong direct contrast to 'the flesh' the Holy Ghost in His personality, as well as His activity, seems to be meant. See Appendix, Note F.

is] The following nine words are best divided into three groups describing, first, the soul in relation to God; secondly, the attitude of the character towards others; thirdly, the principles of conduct in daily life.

love] It does not seem that this fairly common Septuagint word (*agapé*) has been found in the pre-Christian papyri. It occurs once in Philo; see Col. i. 4 note. It is a false reading in an inscription at Tefeny in Pisidia belonging to 'the Imperial Period,' in what is only too plainly a heathen context (see W. H. P. Hatch, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1908, vol. XXVII. pp. 133 sqq.). Placed first, because Augustine says rightly of sanctification: 'Charitas inchoata, inchoata justitia est; charitas provecta, provecta justitia est; charitas magna, magna justitia est; charitas perfecta, perfecta justitia est' (*De Nat. et Gr.* § 84).

longsuffering] i.e. evenness of temper (Col. i. 11).

gentleness] 'kindness,' R.V., i.e. kindliness (Col. iii. 12); 'a grace pervading and penetrating the whole nature, mellowing there all which would have been harsh and austere,' Trench, *Synonyms*, § lxiii. In 2 Cor. vi. 6 Rheims translates the same word by 'sweetness.'

goodness] beneficence, kindliness showing itself in kind actions, Rom. xv. 14; Eph. v. 9; 2 Th. i. 11†.

faith] The position excludes the ordinary meaning, faith on God upon which St Paul lays so much stress in this Epistle. It may mean 'fidelity,' Tit. ii. 10, and perhaps Mt. xxiii. 23. Jerome, however, explains it as trust in persons due to love: *Qui diligit, nunquam se laedi aestimat: nunquam aliud nisi quod diligit et diligitur, suspicatur. Quum autem dilectio procul abfuerit, et fides pariter abscedit*, and this alone satisfies the context, which speaks of active, not passive virtues. See also Phm. 5.

23. *meekness*] It is exercised primarily towards God (Matt. v. 5, xi. 29), but, as receiving all things at His hands, issues necessarily in meekness towards men, Col. iii. 12.

temperance] Better as R.V. marg. 'self-control,' Ac. xxiv. 25; 2 Pet. i. 6 *bis*†; cf. 1 Cor. vii. 9, ix. 25; Tit. i. 8; 'self-mastery,' especially against sensual pleasures. It is the opposite of 'incontinency,' 1 Cor. vii. 5. 'Chastity' is added by Wyclif and Rheims with a few 'Western' authorities.

The last clause of this verse is difficult. It is frequently interpreted as a platitude, that the Law is not against the good qualities named in *v.* 22: cf. 1 Tim. i. 9. But St Paul must mean more than this, and is in fact recalling *v.* 18.

against such] (1) Hardly masc. in contrast to 'they which practise,' *v.* 21, cf. also *v.* 24, as though Law, or the Law, loses its power, or claim,

24 And they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the
25 [1]affections and lusts. If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk

[1] Or, *passions.*

over the godly: cf. Rom. viii. 31—34; Col. ii. 14. (2) But neuter in contrast to 'such things,' *v.* 21. Law, or the Law, has no power to prevent the development of these qualities, as it did by 'causing the offence to abound,' Rom. v. 20, cf. vii. 9—12, for they are produced by the Spirit.

there is no law] That the Greek word for 'law' without the article may in certain cases mean 'the Law' has been shown at ii. 16, but it is questionable whether this is so here. It is on the whole safer to be content with the translation 'there is no law,' i.e. there is nothing having the force of law (even in its highest example the Law of Moses).

St Paul, that is to say, having in earlier parts of the Epistle shown the powerlessness of the Law to produce good, and even the hindrance that it was in attaining righteousness (ii. 21), now says that the preceding good qualities are produced in us as the fruit of the Spirit in spite of all the hindrances that the Law, or any other law, can make.

24. *And they*] The verse is to be taken closely with the preceding clause. So far from Law prevailing against the production of such virtues, union with Christ has brought to an end the power of the flesh.

that are Christ's] 'that are of Christ Jesus,' R.V. with the best authorities. They who belong to the Messiah—I mean Jesus, who Himself lived superior to the power of the Law and the flesh.

have crucified the flesh] 'Crucify' metaphorically only here and vi. 14. The time is apparently the moment of their first union with Christ, symbolized and consummated at baptism: cf. Col. ii. 12. The article is generic, hardly possessive.

with the affections and lusts] 'with its passions and its lusts.' The flesh together with what it implied. The word translated 'passions' may be used in its more common sense of 'suffering' or 'experience,' but the context and the presence of 'lusts' seem to give it a bad connotation, as in Rom. vii. 5; 'with the appetites and lustes' (Tyndale). The plural in both cases denotes the many forms and varieties (cf. Eph. ii. 3; Rom. i. 24, vi. 12) issuing, for example, in the sins of *vv.* 19—21.

25—vi. 6. *Life by the spirit brings unselfish care for others, e.g. for one's teachers.*

(*v.* 25) Life by the spirit leads to a life in right relation to others. (*v.* 26) We must all beware of conceit, self-assertion, envy. (vi. 1) For example, my brethren; take even the case of a man overcome in any transgression; you who live and walk by the spirit must amend him, in your spiritual life marked by meekness, each of you considering his own liability to temptation. (*v.* 2) So generally; carry each other's burdens, thus filling up the measure proposed for you by the true law, that which is seen in and brought by Christ. (*v.* 3) For refusal to do this, due to an overhigh estimate of oneself, means

in the Spirit. Let us not be desirous of vain glory, pro- 26
voking one another, envying one another.

Brethren, [1]if a man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are 6

[1] Or, *although.*

self-deception. (*v.* 4) Let each test, not his heart, but his work, and so find satisfaction about himself, not in his superiority to others. (*v.* 5) This is important, for hereafter each shall carry his own load. (*v.* 6) An example of carrying each other's burdens; let the taught share in temporal things with his teacher.

25. *If we live in* ('by,' R.V.) *the Spirit*] St Paul returns to the thought of *v.* 16*a*, but by the way of contrast to *v.* 23 and of development of *v.* 24. It is not the Law but the spirit by which we must regulate our life, as I said in *v.* 16*a*.

Yet St Paul, as usual, *recule pour mieux sauter*. As *v.* 16*a* served as an introduction to the true means of holy living, so here he shows how life by the spirit will lead them to right relations to others. This, it will be noticed, had been slightly touched upon in *vv.* 13—15, and indirectly in *vv.* 20, 22.

'*By* the spirit' is probably right as in *v.* 16. Lightfoot translates '*to* the spirit,' referring to 'the parallel passage' Rom. vi. 2, 10, 11, and comparing Rom. xiv. 6, 8; 2 Cor. v. 15. But in all these places the meaning is clear from the context. Here nothing suggests so sudden a change. On 'Spirit' see Appendix, Note F.

let us also walk in the Spirit] 'by the Spirit let us also walk,' R.V. 'walk'; the same Greek word as in vi. 16; Rom. iv. 12; Phil. iii. 16; Ac. xxi. 24†. See note on 'answereth,' iv. 25. It is more than the 'walk' of *v.* 16, for it regards the walk in relation to others, who are also walking. It suggests unity, and perhaps discipline.

26. *Let us not be*] In contrast to the preceding suggestion of harmony. Observe the humility and tact whereby St Paul writes as though he himself was exposed to this temptation. Perhaps he was; certainly they were, by the very fact of their disputes. Controversy easily engenders self-conceit.

desirous of vain glory‡] 'vainglorious,' R.V. Cf. 'vain glory,' Phil. ii. 3†, which is coupled in 4 Mac. ii. 15 with love of power, arrogance, boasting and slander. For the thought cf. vi. 3.

provoking one another] 'Ex parte potentiorum' as envyings 'ex parte infirmiorum' (Bengel).

CHAPTER VI.

1—6. For the summary of these verses see the note at v. 25.

1. A specific example in which there would be the more need to exercise the unity demanded in the preceding verse v. 26.

Brethren] i. 11 note. In itself a summons to unity. It is quite unnecessary, with Zahn, to remove it to the end of c. v.

if] 'even if,' R.V. St Paul, according to the *nuance* of the Greek,

spiritual, restore such a one in the spirit of meekness; con-
2 sidering thyself, lest thou also be tempted. Bear ye one
3 another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ. For if a

puts the case as though it may not happen; contrast Lk. xi. 8. 'If' alone would not have marked the progress in the need for loving behaviour. Thus 'even' does not emphasize 'be overtaken' but the whole clause from 'overtaken in a fault'; in 1 Cor. vii. 11, 28 the single verb is the whole clause.

a man] Hardly to lay stress on his human, and therefore weak, nature, *v.* 7 (Chrys., Theodoret, Jerome, Luther), but generally, Rom. iii. 28.

be overtaken] So R.V., Field. Elsewhere in the N.T. (Mk. xiv. 8; 1 Cor. xi. 21†) in the active, and used literally. Only once in the LXX., Wisd. xvii. 17, of an Egyptian in the field overtaken by the plague of darkness. So here 'overtaken' or 'overpowered' by the devil, when *in a fault* ('in any trespass,' R.V.) is epexegetic. Lightfoot and others however prefer to render it 'surprised' ('John' viii. 4), when 'in any trespass' marks that in which the man was caught. It is more difficult to act kindly to a person surprised *flagrante delicto*.

ye which are spiritual] Not ironical, but a serious appeal to those who were both living and walking by the spirit (v. 25); cf. Rom. xv. 1.

restore] Better, 'amend.' So of damaged nets, Mt. iv. 21, and metaphorically 1 Cor. i. 10; 1 Th. iii. 10; Heb. xiii. 21; 1 Pet. v. 10. The tense of the Greek suggests patience and continued effort.

such a one] 'the man in this condition,' 1 Cor. v. 5, 11.

in the spirit of meekness] v. 23; 'in a spirit,' R.V., is unnecessary for the phrase is closely connected with 'ye that are spiritual,' and 'meekness' is almost an afterthought, descriptive of the spirit when behaving in the way required. See Appendix, Note F.

considering ('looking to,' R.V.) *thyself*] Individualizing; cf. iv. 7; contrast Phil. ii. 4. Alford compares Thuc. I. 42.

lest thou also be tempted] St Paul does not say 'lest thou sin.' The believer dreads temptation, with the severity of conflict and the possible fall, and therefore sympathises with one who has been exposed to it and has been 'overtaken.'

2. The suggestion of common weakness producing sympathy with a fallen brother leads to the thought of active help. But, as usual with St Paul, this passes beyond the immediate connexion to a wider statement. The asyndeton suggests that he is illustrating the particular case by a general principle.

Bear ye] v. 10. In Rom. xv. 1 St Paul states his meaning plainly without the metaphor of 'burden.'

one another's] He has now come to a clear contrast to v. 26.

burdens] Plural†. For the singular with 'bear' see Mt. xx. 12. The reference is wide, all that causes them anxiety and that can be borne by others (contrast *v.* 5). St Paul, it must be remembered, was writing to those who were inclined to carry wrong burdens, those of

man think himself to be something, when he is nothing, he deceiveth himself. But let every man prove his own work, 4

legal enactments; cf. Ac. xv. 28, 10; Rev. ii. 24. See also Jerome on *v.* 3, p. 521 C.

and so] In contrast to the false way proposed to them.

fulfil] Mt. xiii. 14; 1 Cor. xvi. 17; Phil. ii. 30. Fill up completely as though it were a goblet showing the measure proposed for you. A few old authorities read 'ye shall fulfil' and so Wyclif and Rheims. The word is used in the papyri of completing a contract, and of making up a rent (see Moulton and Milligan in *Expositor*, VII. 5, 1908, p. 267).

the law of Christ] The phrase is unique, but cf. Jas. i. 25. Not of Jesus as meaning the law that Jesus spake, e.g. 'love one another,' John xiii. 34 (Jerome), or the Sermon on the Mount, but 'of Christ,' i.e. 'the law of the Messiah.' This includes not only all His words and deeds but probably also the whole principle of His self-sacrifice, in His Incarnation, Passion, Resurrection (cf. Eph. v. 1, 2). In this sense Bengel is right: *Lex Christi lex amoris*, for this is love itself. St Paul thus returns to the thought of v. 13, 14, but, as always, giving his words a deeper and wider range. Thus there is a sense in which the believer is 'under the law' (cf. 'the life under the law,' Ecclus. *Prol.*), but it is 'under the law of Christ' (1 Cor. ix. 21), and seeing that it is subjection to a principle, or rather to a Person, and not to a command or series of commands, it is the very opposite to subjection to the Law of Moses, though, of course, in one sense, moral obligation to a Person is the highest Law of all. That 'Christ' here is more than a personal name see the note on Col. i. 7 in C.G.T.

3. *For if*] To be joined closely with *v.* 2, not *v.* 1. 'For that opinion of self which will not suffer a man to stoop to this [i.e. bearing another's burdens], is mere self-deception' (Jowett). Cf. Phil. ii. 3, 4, where also vainglory is contrasted with helping others; cf. v. 26.

when he is nothing] i.e. 'though he is nothing.' Probably to be taken with the preceding words. If with the following we must translate 'because he is nothing.'

he deceiveth‡ himself] Literally, he deceives even his own mind; he becomes conceited without any cause. The substantive is found in Tit. i. 10‡.

4. *But let every man prove his own work*] The emphasis lies on 'work.' To test oneself (1 Cor. xi. 28; 2 Cor. xiii. 5) might under the circumstances only increase the mental deception. Work as something external can be considered more dispassionately. Also it is his own work that he must test, not that of another. *Neque enim si alius perfecte non potest ad Christianismum a Judaismo transire, idcirco tu perfectus es Christianus* (Jerome).

'Prove.' Although the word in itself is neutral it generally has in the N.T. the connotation of approval, and so here, as is evident from the next clause; see both Lightfoot and Milligan on 1 Th. ii. 4. Trench, *N.T. Syn.* § 74, compares our English expression 'tried men.'

and then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone, and not in
5 another. For every man shall bear his own burden. Let
him that is taught in the word communicate unto him that
7 teacheth in all good *things*. Be not deceived; God is not

and then] On the presupposition that the result is satisfactory.

rejoicing] 'glorying,' R.V., i.e. 'his ground for glorying about himself alone.'

and not in another] i.e. 'and not about his neighbour.' Lit. the other with whom he compares himself. St Paul is condemning the spirit of the Pharisee, Lk. xviii. 11. Luther (p. 282 *a*) understands it of glorying in being praised by another, but even if this interpretation is possible, it is not so near the thought of the context.

5. *For every man*] This testing of yourselves is necessary, *for* etc. Observe that when St Paul wrote this sentence it was not the platitude that it is now. For probably individual responsibility was not as clearly known, especially in circles dominated by Jewish ideas of the solidarity of Israel and the merits of the Fathers.

shall bear] *v.* 2. Here, as it seems, at the Day of Judgment.

his own burden] 'load,' R.V. marg. The difference between the Greek word in *v.* 2 and that employed here appears to be that the former is wider, and may be used of any weight additional to what is already incurred, while the latter is a load actually carried and belonging, as it were, to the person who bears it. Compare Ecclus. xxx. 33 (xxxiii. 25), 'fodder, and a stick, and loads, for an ass.'

6. *Let*] 'But let,' R.V. The verse gives a special instance of the burden-bearing expected of believers (*v.* 2). 'But,' in contrast to the selfishness implied in *v.* 3.

him that is taught] The Greek word refers to oral teaching, and is therefore translated 'catechized' in Rheims. It is not found in the LXX., and occurs in St Paul's writings, Rom. ii. 18; 1 Cor. xiv. 19 only.

in the word=the Gospel; see 1 Th. i. 6; 2 Tim. iv. 2; Col. iv. 3 (where see note in C.G.T.).

communicate] not strictly 'give' but 'share with,' which implies also 'go shares with'; so also Phil. iv. 15.

unto him that teacheth] The same word as before. The active occurs elsewhere in the N.T. only in 1 Cor. xiv. 19.

in all good things] For there are many ways in which he may be helped. It has been suggested that the strong language of the following verse precludes a reference here to temporal blessings, but, as will be seen, that verse belongs to a wider connexion of thought. The context here suggests that St Paul is thinking chiefly, and probably solely, of monetary and other temporal assistance, 'his goods' (Rheims). For the term 'good *things*' see Luke xii. 18, 19, xvi. 25, and for the thought 1 Cor. ix. 11. Ramsay (*Gal.* pp. 456 sqq.) shows how important such a charge was, because the heathen never received teaching from their priests, and only paid fees for each sacrifice as it was

mocked: for whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. For he that soweth to his flesh shall of the flesh reap 8

offered. 'There were no instructors, and no voluntary contributions for their support.'

7—10. *Show such kindness, for the harvest will come.*

(*v.* 7) Refusal to help others is, in reality, mocking God, who does avenge every insult, and bring the harvest of each man's sowing. (*v.* 8) You remember the parable, where the ground made the difference? So if a man makes his own flesh the recipient of his efforts, the flesh will yield him a harvest of corruption. But if the spirit it will yield him life eternal. (*v.* 9) But let us do that which is good and fair to see, without grudging our task, for at harvest we shall reap if we faint not now. (*v.* 10) So therefore while we have sowing-time, let us do the work of good and kind deeds towards all, chiefly, I need hardly say, to our fellow-members of God's household, all of whom have faith upon Him.

7. The connexion is: If you spare yourselves and do not help others, e.g. your teachers as I have just said, you are living for the flesh, not the spirit, however much you deceive yourselves (*v.* 3).

Be not deceived] Better, 'Do not err.' The phrase occurs elsewhere in the N.T. only in 1 Cor. vi. 9, xv. 33; Jas. i. 16. The context here suggests that the Greek verb is in the middle voice, and not the passive, as certainly in Mark xii. 24, 27.

God] Suddenly introduced because their pretence to piety is really mocking Him. The absence of the article in the Greek is due to the fact that St Paul is contrasting His nature and position with those of men. Compare ii. 6.

is not mocked†] The Greek verb occurs in 2 Chr. xxxvi. 16; Prov. i. 30. A compound of it is found in Luke xvi. 14, xxiii. 35†, in each case Christ being the object. The verb properly means 'turn up the nose' (so 'mock,' also='wipe the nose'). It means 'the open gesture of contempt for one who is an easy dupe' (Perowne).

whatsoever a man soweth] A proverbial saying, see below, but perhaps here suggested by St Paul's reminiscence of his recent words to the Corinthians, 2 Cor. ix. 6. On the relation of this passage to the collection for the saints at Jerusalem (1 Cor. xvi. 1) see the Introduction, pp. xxiii. sq. 'A man.' Unlike *v.* 1, where see note.

that shall he also reap] Cf. Job iv. 8. Wetstein quotes Aristotle, *Rhet.* III. 3, 'but thou sowedst these things in disgraceful fashion, and didst reap an ill harvest of them,' and Cicero, *de Orat.* II. 65, 'ut sementem feceris, ita metes.'

8. St Paul defines what he means by sowing, but leaves the thought of strict identity of the seed, and, like our Lord in Mt. xiii., regards the difference of soil into which the seed is cast.

For] The reason for the statement *whatsoever* etc.

he that soweth to his flesh] 'unto his own flesh,' R.V. The Greek for 'sow unto,' marking the ground into which seed is sown, is found in

corruption; but he that soweth to the Spirit shall of the
9 Spirit reap life everlasting. And let us not be weary in well
10 doing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not. As we have therefore opportunity, let us do good unto all *men*, especially unto them who are of the household of faith.

Mk. iv. 15, 18 (‖Mt. xiii. 22). This is more natural than to understand 'unto' only as 'with a view to,' or 'for the indulgence of.' Observe 'his own,' laying stress on the selfishness of the man.

of (lit. 'out of') *the flesh*] So out of that ground will come his harvest. Probably read 'his flesh,' though there is no stress laid on 'his own.' But possibly 'the flesh' in this clause means the whole of the anti-spiritual world of which 'his own flesh' was but a part.

shall...reap corruption] The dissolution that marks all created things (Rom. viii. 21), nowhere more apparent than in 'flesh.' But as 'the flesh' here is primarily moral, so also it is moral dissolution of which the Apostle is chiefly thinking; cf. Eph. iv. 22; Jude 10.

but he that soweth to ('unto,' R.V.) *the Spirit*] Not the personal Spirit of God, but the Divine Spirit generally, precisely as in v. 17, 22. Yet not 'his own' here, for 'per nos sumus carnales, non spirituales' (Bengel).

shall of the Spirit reap life everlasting] The true side of the doctrine of 'merit.'

9. *And*] Really in contrast to the doubtfulness of the double issue.

let us not be weary] Better, 'faint-hearted,' 2 Th. iii. 13. 'Weary' (also R.V.) suggests fatigue, but the Greek word refers to mental disinclination; cf. Polyb. IV. 19. 10. So Symmachus, Is. vii. 16 and elsewhere, uses it to translate *qutz*, 'loathe.'

in well doing] 'Well,' the good in fact and appearance.

in due season] Better, 'at its own time,' i.e. of harvest.

we shall reap, if we faint not] Here comes the thought of fatigue, and that too great for strength. Mt. xv. 32 (‖Mk. viii. 3); Heb. xii. 3, 5†; cf. 1 Mac. iii. 17, 'what? shall we be able, being a small company, to fight against so great and strong a multitude? And we for our part are faint, having tasted no food this day,' and Judas' noble answer. The Greek Fathers interpreted the words 'without fainting,' i.e. of the heavenly reaping in contrast to the toil of earthly reapers, and so Tyndale ('For when the tyme is come, we shall repe with out werines'), but the thought is not so appropriate to the context.

10. *As we have...opportunity*] Better, 'while we have...time'; c. John xii. 35, 36. 'Time' = a seasonable time for sowing; cf. *v.* 9.

do good] 'work that which is good,' R.V. 'Good,' the Greek word is more ethical than that found in *v.* 9, and suggests kindness.

unto ('toward,' R.V.) *all* men] For Christian love knows no limitation of object.

them who are of the household] The Greek term is used of members of an earthly household, 1 Tim. v. 8. Here of the heavenly, as in Eph. ii. 19.

Ye see how large a letter I have written unto you with 11

of faith] It is questionable whether the R.V. 'toward them that are of the household of the faith' does not say more to English ears than the Greek intended. For 'the faith' suggests 'the doctrine' about Christ etc. But St Paul may well have meant 'faith' generally speaking, the Greek article being in reality due to the preceding article: 'unto the members of the household that is characterized by faith.' Faith in God, not 'the faith' as a synonym for the Gospel, marks this household; see Luke xviii. 8, and probably even 2 Th. iii. 2. Faith is represented not as the master, nor as the material, of the house, but as a characteristic common to the members.

11—16. Autographic summary, *the autograph continuing till v.* 18.

A contrast of the aims of the false teachers and of his own. The cross as the means of the new creation in believers is all important.

(*v.* 11) The very size of my letters shows the importance of what I, Paul, write with mine own hand in the following verses. (*v.* 12) These men are urging you to be circumcised, not from any love to the Law as such, but only that they may not be persecuted (by Jews or Jewish Gentiles) for professing the cross of Christ [Jesus]. (*v.* 13) Yes, this is their motive, for even the circumcision party do not really care to keep the Law, but they wish you to be circumcised, that they may boast of their success in the very flesh of you Gentiles. (*v.* 14) Such is not my own aim. God forbid that I should boast (i.e. in converts or aught else) save in the cross endured by our Lord Jesus Christ, the cross by which the very world has to me, I say, been crucified and I to the world. (*v.* 15) In this, and this alone, I boast, for through the cross comes the one thing of importance, not circumcision or uncircumcision, but a new creation to me and others. (*v.* 16) And so as many as shall take this principle for their standard and rule in daily life—Peace be upon them here and Mercy in the great day, even upon those who are the true Israel, the Israel of God.

11. *Ye see how large a letter*] 'See with how large letters,' R.V. 'Letter.' (*a*) The Greek word does sometimes mean epistle; see Ac. xxviii. 21; 1 Mac. v. 10; cf. Luke xvi. 6, 7; 2 Tim. iii. 15. In this case St Paul would be calling attention to the fact that he has written the whole of this Epistle with his own hand, as a proof of the trouble that he has taken for them. But then the dative in the Greek is almost inexplicable. (*b*) Doubtless we should understand 'letters' (2 Cor. iii. 7), referring to the form of writing. 'See ye what maner lettris I have write to you' (Wyclif).

Why does St Paul call attention to the size of his letters?

(*a*) Presumably to show the emphasis with which he writes and the importance of what he is saying. For larger letters were used in his day, as sometimes in our own, to lay stress on important parts of

12 mine own hand. As many as desire to make a fair shew in

a document, especially in a public inscription. Ramsay (*Gal.* p. 466) refers to examples at Pisidian Antioch, and at Pompeii. So according to a papyrus of 265 B.C. a notice is to be put on a board 'in large letters' (Moulton and Milligan, *Expositor*, VII. 6, 1908, p. 383). The verses from here to the end of the Epistle are so important a summary of St Paul's statements that they would justify the use of large letters. Gal. i.—vi. 10 may have been in cursive hand. If so the papyrus of July 24, 66 A.D., in the Cambridge University Library, Add. 4052 (reproduced in Grenfell and Hunt's *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, II. no. 246, and in Deissmann's *Licht vom Osten*, p. 112; E. T. pp. 160 sq.), gives the reverse case. Officials certify in cursive hand to the accuracy of the statements made in uncial by the writer of the letter.

(*b*) There is no connotation of ill-shapen letters (Chrysostom), either in 'how large' or the context, for there is none in 'with my own hand' (see below) nor even in 'marks,' *v.* 17. Hence it is unnecessary to see in the word a suggestion either of St Paul's disregard of elegance, or of a reference to injury to his hand and so of suffering endured for Christ.

(*c*) Deissmann's explanation (still repeated in *Licht vom Osten*, pp. 105, 110; E. T. pp. 153, 159) that St Paul says in playful irony, my large letters are for you children, belongs, as Ramsay rightly says, 'to the region of pure comedy' (*Gal.* p. 466).

I have written] No doubt the R.V. marg. should be accepted, 'I write.' So also in Phm. 19, 21.

unto you] In the Greek this follows 'how large' and Lightfoot therefore thinks that it is placed there to emphasize that, and translates: 'how large, *mark you*,' but probably its position is due to euphony, and the English versions are right in taking with 'I write.'

with mine own hand] Phm. 19. Even in Phm. it probably does not refer to the whole letter; much less here. For St Paul's practice of writing closing salutations, and brief summary statements, with his own hand, as evidence of authenticity, see 2 Thess. iii. 17; 1 Cor. xvi. 21; Col. iv. 18. Milligan on the passage in 2 Thess. (Appendix, Note A, p. 130) compares 'the σεσημείωμαι (generally contracted into σεση), with which so many of the Egyptian papyrus-letters and ostraca close.' See also Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 105; E. T. p. 153. In our Epistle there is no salutation, strictly speaking, and the summary statements are larger than elsewhere. But *vv.* 12—16 are a recapitulation of the whole Epistle. It seems unlikely that St Paul would write a whole Epistle in large letters, especially as he had others with him who could write for him (i. 2).

12. The absence of a connecting particle indicates that this is the writing to which St Paul refers in *v.* 11. It doubtless continues to the end of the Epistle.

to make a fair shew‡] The adjective of the Greek verb is found in the LXX. of Gen. xii. 11† of Sarah being 'of fair appearance,' which is

the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised; only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ. For 13
neither they themselves who are circumcised keep the law;

used also of fair external appearance in contrast to the reality within. Thus here the verb means 'to be of fair and specious appearance.' Bengel compares 2 Cor. v. 12. It is used in a moral sense, as here, also in a papyrus of 114 B.C. (Moulton, *Expositor*, Febr. 1903, p. 114, referred to in Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten*, p. 63; E. T. p. 96).

in the flesh] i.e. 'in earthly and visible things,' almost equivalent to 'in the world' (cf. *v.* 14), but 'the flesh' regards the individual and his mode and aim (*v.* 8) of existence (cf. iii. 3, v. 17), rather than the sphere in which he moves. It can hardly mean literal flesh, in the sense that they wish to be of fair and specious appearance in another person's flesh, i.e. by getting him circumcised (cf. *v.* 13; Rom. ii. 28), to which indeed the English 'to *make* a fair show' lends itself.

constrain] Better than 'compel,' R.V., for the meaning of the Greek verb comes short of absolute compulsion, Luke xiv. 23. What they had failed to accomplish in the case of Titus, ii. 3, they are bringing to pass in yours.

to be circumcised (ii. 3); *only*] Elliptical, ii. 10; not from any true love of the Law, but only etc.

they should suffer persecution] In the Greek this comes emphatically at the end, 'only that, for the cross of Christ—they may not be persecuted.' The false leaders therefore are Jewish Christians, who fear persecution at the hands of Jews, or of Gentiles stirred up by Jews. For although Gentiles would normally reckon circumcised Christians as Jews (who had a *religio licita*, see Jerome), yet if urged on by Jews they would persecute all Christians, Jewish Christians included.

for the cross of Christ] The dative is hard, and is probably best explained as the dative of the occasion (2 Cor. ii. 12), 'for professing the cross of Christ' (Lightfoot). Otherwise as the R.V. marg. 'by reason of the cross of Christ.'

13. *For neither*] 'not even,' R.V. I attribute this unworthy reason of fear to them, for etc.

they themselves who are circumcised] 'they who receive circumcision do themselves,' R.V. The Greek verb is passive, and timeless, 'the circumcision party'; for the full force of the present tense is excluded by the fact that these evidently have themselves been circumcised. The R.V. marg. 'have been circumcised' is a translation of a less probable Greek text. The persons are apparently the same as those of *v.* 12 (and therefore Jewish Christians), the 'not even' referring to the whole clause, not only to 'they who receive circumcision.'

keep the law] Not as R.V. marg. 'a law,' for St Paul probably means the Law of Moses; see ii. 16 note. Why do they not keep it? (*a*) Because of their distance from Jerusalem (Theodoret)? But St Paul's words imply blame, which then would hardly be credible.

but desire to have you circumcised, that they may glory in
14 your flesh. But God forbid that I should glory, save in the
cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, [1]by whom the world is
15 crucified unto me, and I unto the world. For in Christ

[1] Or, *whereby*.

(*b*) Because no one can keep it, as they have themselves acknowledged by believing on Christ? But then St Paul would surely blame them directly for their inconsistency. (*c*) Because to keep the Law externally is not to keep it fully; it must be kept spiritually (v. 14)? But even this is to read too much into the words. (*d*) The simplest explanation is that they do not really try to keep it; their actions show insincerity (Lightfoot).

glory] Contrast not only the next verse but also Phil. iii. 3, 4. It is probable that few Jews of ancient or modern times would fail to pardon Jewish Christians their faith on Jesus if they also brought Gentile Christians to circumcision.

in your flesh] 'Your' is emphatic; because thus you are proved to be their disciples. They will boast 'We have won Gentiles to acknowledge the binding character of the Law of Moses.'

14. *God forbid*] Literally 'may it not be.' The R.V. gives another paraphrase 'far be it from me'; see Gen. xliv. 7; Josh. xxiv. 16 and cf. Mt. xv. 28.

that I] 'I' is in an emphatic position for contrast with those of whom he has just spoken.

the cross, etc.] Which the false leaders dread (*v.* 12). Luther strangely understands the phrase to mean our sufferings for Christ. Chrysostom is especially good here.

by whom] The R.V. text is better, 'through which,' i.e. the cross; cf. v. 24. It was this in which he boasted.

unto me] Emphatic as before.

the world] The Greek word has no article as in 2 Cor. v. 19; 2 Pet. ii. 5; Rom. iv. 13. But although as a translation 'a world' is somewhat grossly inaccurate, yet the absence of the article (occurring, as this does, so very frequently with this word) does suggest that the world at present, by its very constitution, is contrary to spiritual things. For the thought of the passage cf. Phil. iii. 7. 'The world...is to me like yon felon slave, nailed to the cross, dying by a certain and shameful, if a lingering death. And I too am so regarded by the world' (Perowne). Chrysostom writes, 'nothing is more blessed than this dying, for this is the foundation of the life of blessedness.' Contrast the power of the world mentioned in iv. 3.

15. This verse is said by Euthalius (5th cent.), Syncellus (8th cent.), Photius (9th cent.) to be quoted from the *Apocryphon of Moses*, but the statement cannot now be tested. Charles, however, says (*Assumption of Moses*, 1897, p. xvii.), 'There can be no doubt that the borrowing is just the other way, and that this Apocryph is a Christian composition,

Jesus neither circumcision availeth any *thing*, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. And as many as walk according 16
to this rule, peace *be* on them, and mercy, and upon the

of the general contents of which we have no knowledge.' The passage is not contained in the portion of the *Assumption of Moses* that has come down to us, the date of which is placed by Charles between 7 and 30 A.D., i.e. earlier than our Epistle (p. lviii.).

For] I boast in nothing but the cross, *for* through this comes the new creation, which alone is of importance.

in Christ Jesus] Omitted in the R.V. with the Vatican manuscript. The words are doubtless taken from v. 6.

circumcision...uncircumcision] Not circumcised and uncircumcised people (ii. 7, 8; cf. iii. 28), for St Paul is not speaking here of his independence of men; but circumcision as an action (to which 'uncircumcision' is somewhat loosely appended). He attributes no importance to it in itself. Cf. Col. iii. 11.

availeth any thing] 'is...anything,' R.V. following the better reading of the Greek text underlying the A.V., is taken from v. 6, where see note.

a new creature] So indeed 2 Cor. v. 17, a phrase found also in Rabbinic literature (see note on Col. iii. 10 in the C. G. T.), but here the contrast to circumcision and uncircumcision suggests rather the R.V. marg. 'creation,' i.e. the process of new creation in an individual. Meyer gives a list of the characteristics of the new creation, among them ii. 20, iii. 27, v. 6. For the allusion to the Creation compare also 2 Cor. iv. 6.

16. *And as many as*] Without restriction; whatever their nationality or past or even present behaviour. The 'and' makes an apodosis in thought though not in form; if a new creation then peace and mercy.

walk] 'shall walk,' R.V. with the best manuscripts; see v. 25 note. In the future tense lies an invitation. Observe here the insistence on a holy life; yet 'Deed' as determined by 'Creed' of mind and heart.

according to this rule] 'by this rule,' i.e. the maxim of *vv.* 14, 15 culminating in the principle that a new creation is of all-importance. For 'rule' see 2 Cor. x. 13, 15, 16; Judith xiii. 6 (8); Mic. vii. 4 and especially 4 Mac. vii. 21‡ 'For who that lives the pious life of a philosopher according to the whole rule of philosophy etc.'

peace be *on them, etc.*] An adaptation of Pss. cxxv. (cxxiv.) 5, cxxviii. (cxxvii.) 6. Compare the Palestinian recension of the last prayer of the Eighteen Benedictions (*Shemone 'esre*), 'Set Thy peace upon Israel Thy people, and on Thy city and on Thine inheritance, and bless us, yea all of us as one man. Blessed be Thou, O LORD, who makest peace' (see Dalman, *Words of Jesus*, German edition, p. 301).

and mercy] This precise combination and order are unique. Contrast 1 Tim. i. 2; 2 Tim. i. 2; 2 John 3 and even Jude 2. The usual order is 'mercy and peace,' i.e. God's mercy as the ground of peace.

17 Israel of God. From henceforth let no *man* trouble me: for I bear in my body the marks of the Lord Jesus.

Here apparently 'peace' refers to the immediate and 'mercy' the final blessing; cf. 2 Tim. i. 18.

and upon the Israel of God] The phrase is unique. The addition of the words 'of God' to the old form excludes those who are of Israel and yet are not Israel (Rom. ix. 6); cf. Rev. ii. 9. The sentence forms a suitable close to an Epistle which has endeavoured to distinguish clearly those who are and those who are not the true seed of Abraham (e.g. iii. 7, 29, iv. 21 sqq.). Apparently 'and' is epexegetic of 'as many as shall walk,' and 'the Israel of God' includes all true believers whatever their origin; and so, probably, 'the circumcision' in Phil. iii. 3.

17. NOTHING CAN TROUBLE ME; I BELONG TO MY MASTER, JESUS.

A curious addition, illustrative of the strength of the emotion under which the Apostle wrote this Epistle. It is hardly a 'note of denunciation,' but is to show that his own acceptance of Jesus as his Lord and Master is so thorough that nothing can affect his determination to be His. But he puts this into an imperative form; cf. 1 Tim. iv. 12. It contains also a note of confidence in the ultimate triumph of his own efforts, and, by implication, of his teaching.

From henceforth] 'in future.' Zahn rather strangely interprets it not of time at all, but as referring to *v.* 16: 'Let no one of the rest of Israel'; cf. Ac. v. 13. He quotes in confirmation Marcion's text, 'But of the rest let no *man* trouble me in vain,' but he probably omitted 'and upon the Israel of God.'

let no man *trouble me*] Literally 'afford me troubles.' The verb of the substantive for 'troubles' occurs in iv. 11, where it is translated 'I have bestowed labour.' For 'trouble' see Mt. xxvi. 10 (‖ Mark xiv. 6) and especially Luke xi. 7, and with a slight difference in the Greek Luke xviii. 5†. Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, p. 354) quotes an incantation from the papyri, 'if so and so troubles me.'

for I] Still emphatic. See also below.

bear] *v.* 2. Here with some connotation of solemnity in bearing trophies or royal standards (see Chrysostom). The word is used in an incantation quoted by Deissmann of *carrying* an amulet (*Bible Studies*, p. 358). Cf. 'bearing about' in 2 Cor. iv. 10.

in my body] He will not use 'flesh' with its un-Christlike connotation, *vv.* 12, 13.

the marks] The Greek word for 'mark' (*stigma*) is found elsewhere in the Greek Bible only in Cant. i. 11, where it represents 'with studs (lit. points) of silver.' Cf. a Greek Hexaplaric version of Judg. v. 30. St Paul means that his body bears traces of suffering endured for Christ, but it is very uncertain in what way he regards them: (*a*) as brands set on a slave by his master. The marks are proofs that he belongs to

Brethren, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ *be* with your 18
spirit. Amen.

¶ Unto the Galatians written from Rome.

Christ, and that Christ sets him all his tasks and is finally responsible, and will at last make him succeed. He is completely identified with his Master's interests. For this custom of branding see the *Code of Khammurabi*, §§ 226, 227, and quotations in Wetstein. Ramsay (*Gal.* p. 472) says that such marks may still be seen in Turkey as a relic of the time before slavery was abolished there. See Addenda, p. xii.

(*b*) Another explanation, on the whole more probable, but not necessarily excluding the thought of slavery, is that of sacred signs set on things or persons under the protection of a god. See reff. in Wetstein and also 3 Mac. ii. 29, in a decree against the Jews, 'that those who were registered were to be marked, and this by fire on their bodies with the sign of Dionysius, the ivy leaf.' This suggests consecration and therefore immunity from all ordinary claims and molestation. Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, p. 360 note) compares the emphatic 'I' to the equally emphatic *anok* of some incantations.

of the Lord Jesus] R.V. omits 'the Lord' with the best authorities. Observe that St Paul employs not the official (cf. even *v.* 18) but the personal name, perhaps to recall both the sufferings that Jesus Himself bore and the triumphant issue of them. There may thus even be some allusion to the marks recorded in John xx. 27, which perhaps St Paul himself saw. The thought is probably that of 2 Cor. iv. 10 (see also the note in the C. G. T. on 'the afflictions of Christ,' Col. i. 24), that St Paul's sufferings are a reproduction of the sufferings of the Lord Jesus, in toil etc., so far as in his personal life these can be reproduced, and so reproduced they mark him as belonging to Jesus primarily as Master, perhaps also as the Source of his life. Jerome recalling the sufferings mentioned in 2 Cor. xi. 23 sqq. contrasts these with the mark of circumcision. Dr J. H. Moulton suggests that the scars on St Paul were the reasons for which the Roman captain identified him with the Egyptian, Ac. xxi. 38.

18. Valediction.

Brethren] i. 11 note. The R.V. places this rightly at the end of the Epistle, immediately before the Amen. Only here is it found in the valediction. 'Ita mollitur totius epistolae severitas' (Bengel). Similarly St Paul closes 1 Cor. with an expression of love for all his readers, in Christ Jesus. Thus our verse suggests even 2 Cor. xiii. 13, the grace of the Lord Jesus [Christ], and the love of God the Father of all believers, and the fellowship given by the Holy Spirit.

The absence of any personal greetings is doubtless due to the same cause as their absence in Eph., viz. the fact that both Epistles are circular letters to several towns.

the grace] Though 'grace' is found at, or near, the close of each of

St Paul's Epistles, it is still true that 'Hoc congruit cum tota epistola' (Bengel).

of our Lord Jesus Christ] So *v.* 14. The full phrase occurs in Rom. xvi. 20 (W.H. marg.); 1 Th. v. 28; 2 Th. iii. 18 only. Compare also the note on Col. iv. 18 C. G. T.

be *with your spirit*] Phil. iv. 23; Phm. 25† note; cf. 2 Tim. iv. 22. St Paul's usual phrases are 'with you,' 'with you all.' The mention of 'spirit' seems in our Epistle to be a final reminder that their true life lies elsewhere than in the 'flesh' and things pertaining thereto.

Amen] Genuine at the end of an Epistle elsewhere in Rom. only. Here it is due to the solemn earnestness with which he pleads. His final word is a prayer.

Unto the Galatians written from Rome] The oldest form of the subscription appears to have been simply, 'Unto the Galatians.' But there is so much variety that even this can hardly have been in the original, and the R.V. therefore omits it altogether. That 'written from Rome' is a mistake is shown in the Introduction c. IV.

APPENDIX

NOTE A.

'Arabia' in i. 17 *and* iv. 25.

THE terms Arabia and Arabians, as used during the first century A.D., referred not only to the peninsula proper including the Sinaitic peninsula (iv. 25), but also especially to the kingdom of the Nabathaeans. So Josephus expressly in *Ant.* I. 12. 4, § 221. He also speaks of Arabia being on the east of Peraea (*B.J.* III. 3. 3 [§ 47]), of its being visible from the Temple towers (*B.J.* V. 4. 3 [§ 160]), and of its limit in the country of Gamalitis (*Ant.* XVIII. 5. 1, § 113). The Nabathaeans, who presumably came from a more southern part, were settled in Petra B.C. 312 (if not even earlier, in the first half of the 5th cent. B.C.; see Mal. i. 3), and from that time came into frequent touch with the Seleucid, Egyptian, Jewish, and Roman rulers, holding their own with some ease, on account of the natural difficulties of their country. The limits of their kingdom changed, but in the first century A.D. extended as far north as the neighbourhood of Damascus. Damascus itself was under the suzerainty of Rome, but the cessation of Roman coinage there after 33—34 until 62 A.D. makes it probable that during those years it was in the hands of the Arabians, probably ceded to Aretas IV. by Caligula. Thus St Paul's notice, 2 Cor. xi. 32, is so far confirmed. See further Schürer, English Translation, I. ii. pp. 345 sqq., C. H. Turner in Hastings, *D.B.* I. 416, and Nöldeke in Hastings-Selbie, *D.B.* s.v. Arabia.

It is then clear, if the language of Josephus is sufficient guide, that when St Paul speaks of spending two years in Arabia he may mean anywhere in the kingdom of the Nabathaeans, from near Damascus down to the Sinaitic peninsula. As he does not give any closer definition he probably wandered from place to place. He may even have gone as far south as Mt Sinai, but we know too little of the possibilities of travelling at that time in Petra and the districts bordering upon it to be able to say that he could do so. It may be doubted whether the sentimental reason of visiting the scene of the giving of the Law would have appealed to him just after his conversion. The case of Elijah was wholly different: to him the revelation to Moses was the highest conceivable; not so to St Paul.

Note B.

Gal. ii. 1—10 *in relation to* Ac. xv. 4—29.

It has been asserted that it would be a suppression of the truth if St Paul omitted one of his visits to Jerusalem in Gal. i. 17—ii. 10 and that therefore the visit recorded in ii. 1—10 must be his second visit, mentioned in Ac. xi. 29, 30. But this is to misunderstand the object of St Paul's enumeration. He does not seem to have had any interest in his visits to Jerusalem as such, but in his independence of the older Apostles, and if for some reason he did not see them on his second visit—either because of their absence, or because his visit was purely to the administrators of the funds—he would quite naturally omit this visit. That he did not see them on that second visit seems plainly indicated by the wording of Ac xi. 30. There is therefore no *a priori* necessity for identifying the visit of Gal. ii. 1—10 with that of Ac. xi. 29, 30, and we are free to consider the theory that it is the same as that of Ac. xv., the occasion of the conference in Jerusalem.

I. There are however many points of difference between the two reports.

1. St Paul says (ii. 2) that he went up by revelation; St Luke (Ac. xv. 2) that he was sent by the Church at Antioch. But the two statements are not incompatible, especially if the revelation was made to the Church.

2. St Paul says that he took Titus, and enlarges on the question of his circumcision. St Luke never mentions him either in Ac. xv. or anywhere else. Observe however that St Paul uses a term which implies that Titus was only a subordinate (see notes).

3. 'False brethren' (ii. 4) seems too harsh a title to apply to the Jewish Christians of Ac. xv. 1. But, whatever the motive of these may have been, the issue of their teaching was certainly contrary to the Gospel, and if St Paul saw this, and the whole of our Epistle proves him likely to do so, he might easily regard them as 'false brethren.'

4. St Paul speaks of a private interview with 'them of repute,' apparently the Three; St Luke rather of a public meeting. But it may be noticed that St Paul's language ('but privately') implies a public meeting of some kind, and that St Luke implies two public meetings (xv. 4, 6). Judging from the analogy of most public conferences it is probable that they would be preceded, or accompanied, by private interviews.

5. St Paul (ii. 10) speaks of insistence by the Three on his remembering the poor, which, he adds, he was zealous to do. St Luke makes no mention of this. His second visit indeed had the ministry to the poor of Jerusalem for its special object, but the language of Gal. ii. 10 would be extraordinary if descriptive of that mission. It would also have been most ungracious of the Three to insist on this when he had just brought money for them to distribute.

6. St Paul makes no allusion to the decrees about food etc., made at the Council, and disseminated by its letter (Ac. xv. 20, 29). This would, we must confess, be strange if, with Zahn, we date the Epistle soon after the Council (see Introd., p. xxxv.), but not if some years had elapsed, as is more probable. During that time it had become increasingly evident to St Paul that it was impossible to make such decrees binding on Gentile converts, even if they had ever been more than advisory.

7. St Paul speaks of his dispute with St Peter immediately after describing this visit, and it is urged that if the passage ii. 1—10 refers to Ac. xv. it is passing strange that St Peter should so soon have fallen back, and that therefore St Paul in ii. 1—10 really refers to his second visit (Ac. xi. 29, 30). But if St Paul's order is not chronological (see the Commentary) this argument falls to the ground.

II. Even if some doubt be felt about some of the answers to the difficulties now just stated, the points of similarity between the narratives of St Paul and St Luke are enough to make us decide in favour of the theory that Gal. ii. 1—10 and Ac. xv. 4—29 refer to the same events.

1. The chief persons are the same, Barnabas and Paul on the one hand, James and Peter on the other. The fact that St Paul also mentions St John, but not as taking any lead, is hardly an objection. At any rate none of the Three are mentioned in Ac. xi. 29, 30.

2. The subject of the discussion is the same, the freedom of Gentile converts from the Law. If too, as is probable, St Paul's dispute with St Peter (ii. 11—14) chronologically precedes ii. 1—10, the occasion of the discussion is mentioned in nearly similar words, the presence of 'certain from James,' ii. 12, and of some who had 'come down from Judaea,' xv. 1; cf. 24.

3. The general character also of the discussion was the same; a prolonged and hard fought contest.

4. The general result was the same; liberty of the Gentile converts and agreement of the Three with St Paul.

5. Lastly, the dates agree. The second visit (Ac. xi. 29, 30) took place before the death of Herod Agrippa I. in 44 A.D. and the mention of fourteen years in ii. 1 makes it impossible to place the events of ii. 1—10 so early as that. For if we understand the fourteen years of ii. 1 to mean fourteen years from St Paul's conversion, this would throw back his conversion to 31 or even 30 A.D., which is impossible; while if, as is probable, the fourteen years date from the end of the first visit to Jerusalem, i.e. some three years after his conversion, the difficulty is even greater.

6. In spite therefore of acknowledged difficulties—such, after all, as are to be expected when events are related from very different standpoints and with very different objects—it is in every way better to hold to the usual opinion that St Paul in Gal. ii. 1—10 refers to the events recorded by St Luke in Ac. xv. 4—29, than to say that he refers to those recorded in Ac. xi. 29, 30. It is hardly worth while discussing other theories, according to which the situation of Gal. ii. 1—10 is that of Ac. xviii. 22 or xxi. 17.

Note C.

Legal Customs mentioned in this Epistle.

1. *Adoption.*

Adoption was not a Hebrew practice and there is no word in Hebrew for it. But it was extremely common in the Graeco-Roman world. Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, p. 239) speaks of innumerable examples of the term 'adoption' in the pre-Christian Inscriptions of the islands of the Ægean Sea, in the formula *A son of B, but by adoption son of C.* The figure of speech therefore would be readily understood by everyone in St Paul's time[1].

There were however two distinct systems of adoption, one early Greek, the other typically Roman. According to the former, adoption was primarily, in failure of a son by the course of nature, to ensure the observance of religious rites by the adopted son. Thus heirship of property was a secondary consideration. A man was heir only if he was a son by nature or by adoption. Further, the adopter had no power to revoke the adoption.

The Roman system had originally been much the same, but long before Christian times it had become different. Property, as it seems, might be willed away apart from sons, sonship by nature or adoption was no necessary prelude to inheritance. Also the adopter had to buy the adopted from his natural father, though the purchase (repeated thrice) seems to have been in historic times only a legal fiction (see iv. 5 note). Further, the adopter might at any time revoke the adoption.

In iii. 7—9 it must be acknowledged that of the two systems the early Greek is indicated rather than the Roman. But it is extremely improbable that the South Galatians of St Paul's time practised the early Greek system. For it seems to have become decadent. The papyri give examples of inheritance being willed without adoption (even Isaeus at Athens c. 370 B.C. speaks of this), and the Code of Gortyna, published about B.C. 450, even permits the adopter to revoke adoption by simply announcing this from the stone in the Agora before the assembled citizens. Schmiedel even says, 'So far as we have been able to discover, it is not possible, in the Greek sphere, to point to any area, however limited, within which prevailed that irrevocability which Ramsay (*Gal.* p. 351) without qualification speaks of as "a characteristic feature of Greek law"' (*Encycl. Bib.* c. 1609).

The Greek and the Roman laws of adoption are stated by Woodhouse in the *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics* (I. 107 sqq.). See also

[1] Ramsay writes with reference to ii. 6—9: 'The idea that they who follow the principle of Faith are sons of Abraham, whatever family they belonged to by nature, would certainly be understood by the Galatians as referring to the legal process called Adoption' (*Gal.* p. 337).

Schmiedel, *Enc. Bib.* cc. 1608 sq., and especially Dr Dawson Walker's masterly essay on *The Legal Terminology in the Epistle to the Galatians* in his *Gift of Tongues*, pp. 127—134.

2. *The Disposition or Will in Greek Law.*

Akin to the question of Adoption in St Paul's time is that of the Disposition or Will (see iii. 15 note), of which indeed Adoption was one form. Ancient Greek law is said to have differed from the later Roman law in requiring the public confirmation of 'Wills,' and in their irrevocability, but even if this be true it is questionable how long the Greek law remained in force and especially whether it was in force in Asia Minor in St Paul's time.

On the words, 'When it has been confirmed,' iii. 15, Ramsay writes, 'Every Will had to be passed through the Record Office of the city. It was not regarded in the Greek law as a purely private document, which might be kept anywhere and produced when the testator died. It must be deposited, either in the original or in a properly certified copy, in the Record Office; and the officials there were bound to satisfy themselves that it was a properly valid document before they accepted it. If there was an earlier will the later must not be accepted, unless it was found not to interfere with the preceding one. That is a Greek, not a Roman custom. There was no such provision needed in Roman law, for the developed Roman will might be revoked and changed as often as the testator chose; and the latest Will cancelled all others' (Ramsay, *Gal.* pp. 354 sq.). Further, 'as the Galatian Will is unlike the Roman and like the Greek, it is clear that Greek law must have been established among the people to whom Paul was writing' (p. 354).

Dawson Walker however makes it clear that (*a*) the public confirmation of wills was not customary at Athens, where wills were deposited with friends, and their contents remained unknown till the death of the testator; (*b*) at Athens in the 4th cent. B.C. *diathekai* so deposited could, as it seems, be demanded back to be destroyed, or declared no longer valid. Greek wills indeed found in the Fajum etc. often contain clauses that the testator is free to alter or invalidate, which would seem to imply that the opposite was customary, but this is evidence of a very negative character. It is more probable that the Syro-Roman Law Book of the fifth century A.D. represents the custom prevailing in Asia Minor in the first century: 'If a man makes a will, and he who made it makes known in brief the determination that he has formed to make another will, then is the first that he made no longer valid' (Bruns and Sachau's edition, p. 15, quoted by Dawson Walker, *loc. cit.*, p. 142).

We cannot therefore press iii. 15 to indicate that the recipients of the letter were persons who followed specifically Greek customs and belonged to South Galatia rather than to the North.

3. *Guardians and Curators, and the Coming of Age.*

In iv. 2 St Paul says that the heir is under personal guardians and curators of property (see notes) until the time appointed by the father. What relation do these statements hold to the Greek and the Roman law, and what light is thrown by this relation upon the locality of the recipients of the Epistle?

(1) *Personal guardians* ('tutors,' A.V.; 'guardians,' R.V.) *and curators of property* ('governors,' A.V.; 'stewards,' R.V.). In Roman law the father might choose the guardians, but not the curators who were appointed by the State. In purely Greek law the father could appoint both, but there seems to have been no difference in their duties.

In the Syrian Law Book, dating from the fifth century but incorporating much material that is older, the distinction appears to be made, but the father appoints both. It has been argued that this book is Seleucid (therefore practically Greek) and that therefore St Paul is writing to people who were under Greek influence (Ramsay, *Gal.* pp. 391—393). But the evidence for the Seleucid origin of this Law Book is extremely hypothetical. The book is rather purely Roman, with a certain amount of alteration due to later influence. The fact therefore that St Paul presupposes in his readers an acquaintance with the practice that the father appoints both guardians and curators shows only that he is writing to people who did not observe the strictest and most classical form of Roman law. This is to be expected in North and South Galatia alike. But the distinction between the two offices (implied by St Paul's use of the two words) points rather to North Galatia (if it be true that Roman influence prevailed there) than to the South.

(2) '*The time appointed by the father.*'

It has been already shown in the Notes that even in Roman law the father had some choice in this. St Paul's words therefore do not favour the opinion that the Epistle was addressed to readers who were accustomed to Greek law rather than Roman.

On the whole question Dr Dawson Walker's judicial remarks are worth quoting: 'The conclusion to which we are strongly inclined is that St Paul's legal allusions will be ultimately found to be generally grounded on the usages of Roman Civil Law.... How does this bear on the precise destination of the Epistle? To the present writer it seems to have no effective bearing on the question at all. We recall, on the one hand, Ramsay's emphatic assertion that "as North Galatia grew in civilisation it was not Greek, but Roman manners and organisation that were introduced" [*Gal.* p. 373]. We recall, on the other hand, his admission in connection with South Galatia, that in regard to the two Roman colonies, Antioch and Lystra, it might be maintained that their new foundation implied a Romanisation of society [*Gal.* p. 374]. To a certain extent it did so; actual Italian settlers would not abandon their Occidental ideas of family and inheritance. It seems very

probable, therefore, that whether the Christian communities to which the Epistle was sent were situated in North or in South Galatia, there would be a sufficiently strong Roman environment to make such general allusions as St Paul makes to Roman Civil Law quite intelligible. We therefore conclude that the legal allusions in the Epistle are indecisive. There is nothing in them that bears so directly on the question of the locality of the Galatian Churches as to enable us to say decisively whether the Epistle was sent to North or to South Galatia' (*The Gift of Tongues* etc., pp. 174 sq.). See also Schmiedel, *Encycl. Bib.* cc. 1608 sqq.

Note D.

Archbishop Temple on iii. 20.

'I prefer to take the argument in this sense. The law was ordained for a temporary purpose and showed its temporary character by being given through a Mediator. For God, being the eternal unity, can make no abiding covenant with any except those whom He so unites with Himself as to exclude the notion of a Mediator altogether. Or to put it in another way—a mediator implies separation, and a covenant made through a mediator implies perpetual separation while the covenant lasts. Such a covenant therefore cannot be eternal, for God the Eternal One cannot allow perpetual separation from Himself.' A letter in 1852 to the Rev. Robert Scott, afterwards Dean of Rochester (*Life of Archbishop Temple*, II. p. 494).

Note E.

Law or The Law.

In this Epistle the Greek word for 'law' (*nomos*) is found twenty times without, and nine times (excluding vi. 2) with, the article. It is agreed that with the article it always (in this Epistle) means the Mosaic Law, but what of the cases when there is no article? Does it then mean law in the abstract, law in general, of which indeed the Mosaic is the greatest example, or does it mean the Mosaic Law itself?

If St Paul had been a Greek or a Roman we should have unhesitatingly replied that the former of these alternatives was to be accepted. But St Paul was primarily, and above all things, a Jew, and we have to consider Jewish modes of thought and forms of expression rather than Greek or Roman. Now the Hebrew *Tôrah*, of which *nomos* is the

recognized and nearly invariable rendering in the LXX., is used frequently of the Mosaic Law, written or oral (even without the article)[1], but very seldom, if ever, of law in general. We cannot help therefore being very suspicious of the interpretation of *nomos* without the article by law in general, favoured though it is by many scholars. St Paul as a Jew was little likely to turn to abstract modes of thought; he would prefer the more vivid, and have in mind a specific example rather than a general idea. Thus a heathen is to him *anomos* (1 Cor. ix. 21), without the Torah, and the heathen, 'those who have not *nomos*,' i.e. the Law of Moses, even though when they perform unwittingly the things contained in the Law they are a law to themselves (Rom. ii. 14).

We conclude therefore that in all probability St Paul always had the Mosaic Law in mind when he employed *nomos* without the article, unless some other meaning is definitely expressed by the context. Thus in certain cases, especially after prepositions (ii. 19, 21, iii. 11, 18 (?), 23, iv. 4 sq., 21, v. 18; cf. Rom. v. 13, where 'until the Law' corresponds to 'until Moses' in *v.* 14) and after substantives without the article (ii. 16, iii. 2, 5, 10; cf. Rom. ii. 25; Jas. ii. 11, iv. 11), we must translate *nomos* without the article by 'the Law,' meaning thereby the Mosaic Law.

On the other hand we do not intend to deny all force to the absence of the article. The absence lays stress on the quality rather than the thing in itself. 'It is not the Law as the Mosaic Law, but the Mosaic Law as a law' (Winer-Schmiedel, § 19. 13 *h*; cf. § 18. 4 *g*)[2].

Note F.

Spirit or The Spirit.

St Paul's use of the Greek word for spirit (*pneuma*) in the Epistle is perplexing, and is complicated, not explained, by the presence or absence of the article, the secret of his use perhaps being that he did not make in his own mind that sharp distinction which we make between the fully personal holy Being, whom we call the Holy Ghost, and that form of His activity which we term spirit. If only it were permissible to see in the presence of the article an indication that St Paul intended the former, and in its absence the latter, a decision in each case would be easy, but facts do not lend themselves to so mechanical a method. The absence of the article suggests quality and its presence definition, but the reference of the definition is to be determined by many things, notably the context.

[1] e.g. Mechilta on Ex. xv. 2, 'Jah is my strength and song': 'my strength' here means 'the Law.' *Ên ozzi ella tôrah.*

[2] 'Es wird nicht das Gesetz als das mosaische, sondern das mosaische als ein Gesetz bezeichnet.'

St Paul indeed does not speak of spirit in contrast to mere matter. The nearest approach to this is iii. 3 (*pneuma* without the article). But even there 'flesh' is not the material flesh as such, but the sensuous, with its interests in this world, compared with that higher influence and mode of life which may be termed spirit. Such a contrast of 'spirit' to 'flesh' is found also in iv. 29, v. 16, 18, 25 and probably even in v. 5 (all *pneuma* without the article), and also, as it seems, in certain cases where the article is used, v. 17 *bis* and perhaps vi. 8 *bis*.

In one passage St Paul plainly has in mind Him whom we call the Holy Ghost, iv. 6 ('the Spirit of his Son') and we may perhaps allow our less subtle minds to suppose that he intended this also in iii. 2, 5, 14 (all with the article). In v. 22 ('the *pneuma*'), while there is a strong contrast to 'the flesh,' the personal activity of the Holy Ghost seems, on the whole, to be intended. In vi. 18 'your spirit' signifies the higher part of each believer, or perhaps of each man; in vi. 1 *pneuma* is used not so much metaphorically as properly, i.e. of the higher, spiritual, mode of life defined afterwards by the special grace under consideration ('[the] spirit of meekness').

On the possibility of *pneuma* without the article 'expressing clearly and definitely the Holy Spirit in the full personal sense' see further Bp Chase's additional note to his *Confirmation in the Apostolic Age*. But there seems to be no example of this use in our Epistle.

INDICES

I. GENERAL.

Abraham, iii. 6–9
Adoption, iv. 5, pp. 118 sq.
Alms, collection of, p. xxiv; ii. 10
Angels, the law given by means of them, iii. 19; not represented by 'elements,' iv. 3
Antioch of Pisidia, the secondary capital of the Province of Galatia, p. xv; St Paul's speech at, pp. xxxi sq.; p. 67
Apocryphon of Moses, alleged quotation from, vi. 15
Arabia, p. xxiii; i. 17; iv. 25; no reason to think St Paul went to Mt Sinai, p. 115
Asterius, his inaccuracy, p. xxxii

Barnabas, probably took no part in the evangelization of the Galatians, p. xxx; ii. 1
Brothers of the Lord, i. 19

Celts, fanciful argument derived from the supposition that the Galatians of the Epistle were Celts rather than Germans, p. xxxiii
Christ, as mediator, p. 58; His life in the believer, iv. 19
Chronology of O.T., iii. 17; of St Paul's life, p. lii
Cilicia, p. xxii; i. 21
Circumcision, said to be necessary, v. 2
Coming of age, pp. 120 sqq.
Confirmation, possible allusion to, iii. 2; cf. p. 69
Council of Jerusalem, p. xl; pp. 116 sq.
Covenant, the word so translated means 'deed of gift,' 'disposition,' iii. 15
Curators, pp. 120 sqq.
Curse, term applied to Christ, iii. 13

Dative, of the occasion, vi. 12

Eighteen Benedictions, the, p. 111
Ephesian Elders, St Paul's address to, pp. xxxviii sq.
Evil eye, iii. 1

Faith, its relation to the Law, iii. 6; cf. p. 88
Faithful, iii. 9
Fides formata, the doctrine of forensic justification by this cannot be based on v. 6 (p. 88)
Freedom, importance in this Epistle, but reference to it not more suitable to South than to North Galatia, p. xxxi; v. 13; obtained by Christ, v. 1; cf. iv. 5

Gaianus, p. xxix
Galatia, North, early Christianity in, p. xxix

Galatia, South, early Christianity in, pp. xxix sq.
Galatians, possible derivations of the word, p. xiii
Galatians, Ep. to, its resemblances to 2 Cor. and Rom., pp. xxxvii sq.; date, pp. xxxiv–xxxviii, lii; the reason for writing it, pp. xxxix sqq.; its permanent value, pp. xlii sqq.; canonicity and genuineness, pp. xliv sqq.
Gentiles, more sinful than Jews, ii. 15; G. and the Gospel, p. 49
Guardians, pp. 120 sqq.

Hagar, St Paul recalls the meaning not of the word but of the thought, p. 81
Heathen, had no teaching priests, p. 104; their religions as Law, p. 71
Heir, his coming of age, pp. 66, 120
Hort, Dr, held the N. Galatian theory to the last, p. xix

Illyricum, p. xxiii
Inheritance, iii. 18
Inscriptions, evidence as to use of words Galatia, Galatians, pp. xx sq.

James, i. 19; 'some from,' ii. 12
Jerome, follows Origen's commentary, pp. xxxii sq.
Jerusalem, the heavenly, iv. 26
Jewish party among the early Christians—their arguments, p. xl
Jews, in Galatia, p. xxx; misunderstand the true aim of the Law, pp. 34 sq.
Justification, Roman Catholic statement of, p. 34; cf. p. 88

Law, and the Law, pp. 32, 121 sq.; the Oral L., i. 14; the L., its burden, pp. 34 sq.; the L. drives to God, ii. 19; the L. to show the tendency of human nature, p. 56; the L. as a 'paedagogue,' iii. 24, 25; the L. may be even a hindrance, v. 23; the L. not kept by the False Leaders because of their insincerity, vi. 13; the L. of Christ, vi. 2
Legal customs mentioned in the Epistle, pp. 118 sqq.
Letters, autographic certifications appended to documents, pp. 107 sq.
Lord's Prayer, an echo of the, i. 4
Love, by it faith is made operative, v. 6; cf. p. 103

Marcion's edition of the Pauline Epistles, p. xlv
Mediator, iii. 19, 20, p. 121

Names, absence of, in salutation and in close of the Epistle, i. 2

Oral Law, the, i. 14
Origen, almost certainly held N. Galatian theory, pp. xxxii sq.

Patristic evidence, unanimous in favour of N. Galatian theory, p. xxxii
Paul, St, and official Roman terminology, pp. xxi sqq.; his visits to North Galatia, pp. xxiv sqq.; the nature of his illness, p. xxvii; iv. 13; perhaps it affected his eyes, iv. 15; St Barnabas not with him in the evangelization of Galatia, p. xxx; his companions in evangelizing the Galatians, i. 8; chronology of part of his life, p. lii; his teaching not grasped by the early Church, p. xliii (cf. also the Preface); was his mother tongue Greek? p. 69; compares himself to a mother,

iv. 19; his use of 'allegory,' p. 80; accused of change, p. 91; his visits to Jerusalem, pp. 116 sq.
Peter, St, his use of the word 'Galatia,' pp. xix sq.; incident at Antioch before the Council, ii. 11
Pharisee, connotation of the word, i. 15

Rabbinic methods of interpretation, pp. 53 sq., 79 sq., 93

Scripture, personified, iii. 8
Seed, seeds, iii. 16
Slaves, not to be re-enslaved after manumission, ii. 4; freedom by 'slavery' to a god, pp. 67 sq.; branded, pp. 112 sq.
Sonship, Greek and Roman laws of, iii. 7; pp. 118 sqq.
Spirit and The Spirit, pp. 122 sq.
Spitting for fear of infection, p. 75
Syria, p. xxii; i. 21

Testament, see Covenant
Thekla, pp. xxix, xxxi
Timothy, supposed reference to his circumcision, i. 8
Titus, ii. 1; never circumcised, ii. 3
Tôrah, pp. 121 sq.
Traditions, i. 14
Trokmi, pp. xiv, xx
Tutor, iii. 24

Will, see Covenant
'Will' in Greek Law, pp. 119 sq.
Woman, a Jew thanks God that he is not a, iii. 28

II. SOME PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE EXAMINED IN THE NOTES.

	PAGE
Lev. xix. 18	93
Deut. xxi. 23	48
Isa. viii. 14	91
— liv. 1	83
Hab. ii. 4	46 sq.
Mal. iii. 1	75
1 Macc. viii. 1, 2	xvi
2 Macc. viii. 20	xvii
Acts xiii. 16–41	xxxi sq.
— xv. 4–29	116 sq.
— xv. 19, 20, 28, 29	xl
— xvi. 6	xxv sq.
— xviii. 23	xxvi sq.
— xx. 4	xxiv
— xx. 17–35	xxxviii sq.
Rom. xv. 19	xxiii
1 Cor. xvi. 1	xxiii sq.
2 Cor. xii. 7	xxvii
Eph. ii. 15	64
2 Tim. iv. 10	xvii, xxii
1 Pet. i. 1	xix sq.

Based, by kind permission, upon Mr John Murray's Classical Map of Asia Minor.

Copyright.

Date Due

APR 26 1937			
JUL 6 1937			
SCHARR 1937			
RESERVED			
MAY 15 1940			
NOV 25 1941			
MAR 10 '46			
AUG 8 '46			
RESERVED			
AUG 20 '58			
DEC 9 '58			
JAN 2 '59			
OCT 17 '62			
OCT 28 '62			

Form 335—35M—9-34—C. P. Co.

F6

Sch.R. 220.7 C178B V.46 239660

School of Religion

Duke University Libraries
D02471469X

D02471469X
DUKE-LSC